Theological Society
Nov. 28th 1840

No. 251

119-4
.31

THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY.
Princeton, N. J.

Case, Division PS739
Shelf, Sec' .D2
Book, No

Sm

Theological Society's

Library

GHT, JUN.

Timothy Dwight

PRESIDENT DWIGHT'S

DECISIONS OF QUESTIONS

DISCUSSED BY

THE SENIOR CLASS IN YALE COLLEGE,

IN 1813 AND 1814.

From Stenographic Notes,

BY THEODORE DWIGHT, JUN.

NEW-YORK:

JONATHAN LEAVITT, 182 BROADWAY.

BOSTON: CROCKER & BREWSTER, 47 Washington-street.

1833.

Entered according to the Act of Congress, in the year 1833, in the Clerk's Office of the District Court of the Southern District of New-York.

NEW-YORK:—WEST & TROW, Printers.

PREFACE.

The notes from which the following work has been composed, were written in 1813 and 1814, in a stenographic character, from the lips of the late President Dwight, during his instructions to the Senior Class of Yale College, of which the author was a member. The record was made at the time merely for the author's private gratification; and the laborious process of transcribing the original manuscripts has been pursued at occasional intervals of leisure during the years which have intervened, though until recently without any design of publishing.

The instructions given by President Dwight to the Senior Class, which was under his particular care, were extemporaneous; and the sermons which he preached in the college chapel on the sabbath, as Professor of Theology, were the only portion of his productions as a teacher which he committed to paper. On account of a weakness of the eyes, from which he suffered so great a part of his life, he was obliged to resort to the method of extemporaneous instruction, which he rendered at once so interesting and so useful, that it was generally more highly prized by the students than any other of the academic exercises. It was sometimes noticed, that those who had expressed least regard for the preceding studies, were among the most regular and attentive at the recitations of their senior year; and it was no uncommon thing to hear regret expressed, that the tolling of the bell for dinner in the Commons Hall should interrupt a course of remarks, sometimes unconsciously prolonged for more than two hours.

The high repute in which the extemporaneous instructions of the President were held by preceding classes, with a great reverence for his character, excited in the author a strong desire to make as faithful a record of them as possible. He therefore began the collegiate year with the practice of a simple system of stenography, in which he gradually acquired considerable proficiency, and by which, with constant attention, he succeeded in obtaining much more copious notes than he could otherwise have done. It is not to be supposed, that under these circumstances, all the ideas presented by the speaker, with the frequent and forcible anecdotes, contrasts, and comparisons which characterized his conversation, should have been preserved, or that justice should have been done to his style, which often rose to such a pitch of eloquence, as to excite the feelings far above the ordinary level.

The following pages, therefore, claim only to present such a record of the instructions of President Dwight on one branch of the senior studies, as might be expected to be made by a youth of seventeen or eighteen, laboring to hoard up as many of his words as possible, but unavoidably losing many, and sometimes taken by surprise, and interrupted in his task by an appeal to the heart which drove every thing else from the mind, and sometimes moistened the eyes of the speaker and the hearers with tears. Where the notes are most general and meagre, the language of the instructor was sometimes the most fervid, eloquent, and worthy of record: for if the writer had been asked the question, "What are you doing?" once put by a celebrated orator to the master of an orchestra which delayed to perform their symphony at the proper time, he might have replied in the same answer, "Weeping, Sir."

Many persons now living, who have participated in the enjoyment and the benefits of the instructions of Dr. Dwight, will derive gratification from the perusal of this work, because it bears many marks of that mind of which it professes to be but an imperfect portrait, and will necessarily awaken interesting recollections of the instructor of their youth, whose memory is preserved with equal profit and affection. To other readers it may be gratifying to see a record, although an imperfect one, of the familiar language of one, who was well known to excel in conversation, especially employed in his favorite occupation, the training of youth in the ways of knowledge and virtue. This volume may perhaps claim the more regard from the fact, that the year to which it relates was the last in which the health of President Dwight permitted him to perform his collegiate duties without interruption.

The disputations in which the Senior Class engaged twice a week, and which alone are embraced by this volume, occurred between recitations on the various branches of study appropriate to the senior year. Most of these were under the direction of the President, and afforded him opportunities for extemporaneous remarks, not less interesting and valuable: Blair's Lectures, Duncan's Logic, Locke's Essay, Paley's Philosophy, and Vincent's Catechism. On all these the author bestowed equal labor; and volumes containing his notes may perhaps be hereafter added, to form a series, if the present work should receive the approbation of the public.

Some of the opinions on political subjects, it is to be remembered, applied only to the time when they were expressed, which is now about twenty years past.

The "Remarks" which precede many of the Decisions, were made by President Dwight during the reading of the arguments presented by some of the disputants of the day, and were called forth by something which they contained. Although some of them appear to be foreign to the questions under discussion, they were perfectly appropriate, and often instructive.

CONTENTS.

QUESTIONS DECIDED.

Page

DISPUTE I. *November* 2d, 1813. Ought Capital Punishments ever to be inflicted? 7

DISPUTE II. *November* 4th, 1813. Ought Foreign Immigration to be encouraged? 15

DISPUTE III. *November* 9th, 1813. Ought the Liberty of the Press to be restricted? 27

DISPUTE IV. *November* —, 1813. Does the Mind always Think? 33

DISPUTE V. *November* 16th, 1813. Is a Public Education preferable to a private? 37

DISPUTE VI. *November* 17th, 1813. Are the Abilities of the Sexes equal? 41

DISPUTE VII. *November* —, Which have the greatest influence in forming a National Character, Moral or Physical Causes? 45

DISPUTE VIII. *November* 24th, 1813. Is a Lie ever justifiable? 53

DISPUTE IX. *November* 30th, 1813. Ought the poor to be supported by Law? 67

DISPUTE X. *December* 1st, 1813. Would an Extension of the Union be politic? 73

DISPUTE XI. *December* 7th, 1813. Has Christianity been a Temporal Benefit? 77

DISPUTE XII. *December* 8th, 1813. Ought the Clergy to be supported by Law? 83

DISPUTE XIII. *December* 14th, 1813. Ought Anonymous Publications to be suppressed? 91

DISPUTE XIV. *December* 15th, 1813. Would a Division of the Union be beneficial? 95

DISPUTE XV. *December* 20th, 1813. Have the Crusades been beneficial? 105

DISPUTE XVI. *December* 22d, 1813. Ought Religious Tests to be required of Civil Officers? 111

Page

DISPUTE XVII. *December* 28th, 1813. Are all mankind descended from one pair ?..... 117

DISPUTE XVIII. *January* 4th, 1814. Ought Representatives to be bound by the will of their Constituents ?..... 129

DISPUTE XIX. *January* 5th, 1814. Is Party spirit beneficial ?... 135

DISPUTE XX. *January* 11th, 1814. Is a Savage State preferable to a Civilized ?..... 141

DISPUTE XXI. *February* 15th, 1814. Ought Emulation to be encouraged in Schools ?..... 149

DISPUTE XXII. *February* 16th, 1814. Has the Discovery of America been beneficial ?..... 157

DISPUTE XXIII. *February* 22d, 1814. Is Resistance to Government ever justifiable ?..... 167

DISPUTE XXIV. *February* 23d, 1814. Are Theatres beneficial ?... 173

DISPUTE XXV. *March* 1st, 1814. Are Lawyers beneficial ?..... 187

DISPUTE XXVI. *March* —, 1814. Which is more conducive to Literature, a Monarchical or a Republican form of Government ? 199

DISPUTE XXVII. *March* 9th, 1814. Would a Permanent Navy be beneficial to the United States ?..... 209

DISPUTE XXVIII. *March* 10th, 1814. Would a National University be beneficial ?..... 219

DISPUTE XXIX. *March* 16th, 1814. Has a man a right to expatriate himself ?..... 231

DISPUTE XXX. *March* 17th, 1814. Is the study of the Dead Languages beneficial ?..... 239

DISPUTE XXXI. *March* 22d, 1814. Ought the Judiciary to be Independent ?..... 259

DISPUTE XXXII. *March* 23d, 1814. Do Spectres appear ?..... 265

DISPUTE XXXIII. *March* 29th, 1814. Does Temptation diminish the turpitude of a Crime ?..... 275

DISPUTE XXXIV. *March* 30th, 1814. Ought Manufactures to be encouraged in the United States ?..... 281

DISPUTE XXXV. *April* 5th, 1814. Is Privateering justifiable ?.... 289

DISPUTE XXXVI. Ought the Interest of Money to be regulated by Law ?..... 297

DISPUTE XXXVII. *April* 12th, 1814. Is Duelling justifiable ?..... 307

DISPUTE XXXVIII. *April* —, 1814. Are Reviews beneficial ?..... 321

DISPUTE XXXIX. *April* 19th, 1814. Is man advancing to a state of Perfectability ?..... 327

DISPUTE XL. *April* 20th, 1814. Are Wars beneficial ?..... 333

DISPUTE XLI. *April* 26th, 1814. Can the Immortality of the Soul be proved from the Light of Nature ?..... 341

NOTES ON DECISIONS, &c.

DISPUTE I.

November 2d, 1813.

Question. *Ought Capital Punishments ever to be inflicted?*

Remark 1st. It is very common to hear persons use this expression: "put an end to existence," instead of "kill." It was introduced by the atheists of France, as was the custom of calling men "beings" instead of "creatures." They were used to avoid the admission of a Creator's existence, and to imply that there is no future state.

Remark 2nd. Say "the community," not "community;" and "the Deity," instead of "Deity."

Remark 3d. In every case in which you argue from facts, take care that your facts apply.

Remark 4th. In punishing crimes, it is very desirable to administer such punishments as will prevent their recurrence. Stealing a horse is not worse, in point of turpitude, than stealing as much money as the horse is worth: but the former crime has a much more severe punishment annexed to it than the latter. The reason is, that the horse will carry away the thief, while the money will not; and of course, the temptation to commit the crime is greater, and requires a stronger counteraction.

Remark 5th. All the tortures that have been added to death, have been found to render the punishment less efficacious than death alone.

Remark 6th. We ought to make all reasonable endeavors to preserve the lives of others. It is not usually to be expected that men will become penitent in a prison.

Remark 7th. Boring a hole in the bottom of a ship, setting fire to an inhabited house, and some other crimes, are punished with death, because they involve murder, or expose life, by putting the event out of the power of the criminal and of every body else.

Remark 8th. Arson is calculated, in an eminent degree, to break up all peace in society. Treason is one of the greatest crimes possible. Public safety demands an extreme punishment for both. We fear death, because we know it is the passage to eternal punishment or endless happiness: to heaven or to hell.

DECISION.

There have been many publications on this subject. Beccaria handled it with ability; for he was humane in character, gentle in manner, and possessed of much learning. His arguments are not all sound, but even those which are otherwise are specious, and calculated to persuade almost every reader. For a length of time his writings produced great effects in Europe, and had much weight. He led men to look into prisons, and other receptacles of human misery, to enquire into their condition, the systems under which they were conducted, and the means by which they might be improved. But he was in a great measure a theorist; and theo-

retical views are very rarely correct. His writings, however, like the Revolution in this country, brought in a flood of light. Our newspapers took up public matters when the feelings of our countrymen began to be aroused, and they were examined and eagerly read. So in Europe his views attracted and directed the public attention; and the impulse has not yet been lost. I have watched the progress of the thing from that time to this, and observed:

1. That his reasoning is specious, but in many respects unsound. He has not genius nor strength sufficient to give laws to nations.

2. No individual since his time has added much to what he said.

Humanity requires of us much circumspection, in fixing the punishment of crimes; and, on the score of humanity, two considerations present themselves:

1. Is it just to put men to death for crimes which do not involve murder? In the abstract it is not unjust; for God gave the Jews power and right to do it. We, however, lie under no obligations to follow the Jewish laws except where our cases resemble theirs. If a milder punishment will accomplish the object as well among us, as a severer one did among the Jews, we are certainly bound to prefer it. This, however, does not bring in question the abstract justice of this or that punishment: for, as God gave the Jews liberty to punish with death other crimes than murder and those involving murder, it must be right to do so under certain circumstances. Still, this example will not justify us in doing the same, unless necessity requires it; and a change of circumstances may render it proper or

necessary to punish the same crime in a very different manner.

2. As to the policy of punishing with death other crimes than murder. By the word policy here I do not mean cunning, which is dishonest, and seeks private advantage without regard to the nature of the means by which it is to be arrived at. I shall discuss this point, applying the better meaning to the term, which is that of lawful expediency.

You will observe that punishment is intended to retribute evil, in some measure proportionate to the crime committed. We should make it a great object however to reform the criminal, never leaving it out of view, that the grand object of human punishments should be to prevent the recurrence of crime. Death is viewed by different individuals in very different lights. Some are so hardened that they care nothing about it. This, however, is not commonly the case with men; but a long familiarity with crime may harden them to almost any thing. Death is undoubtedly the severest punishment we can inflict. It is often said, but without any sound reason, that the infliction of capital punishment increases the number of capital crimes. In the statistical accounts published in Scotland, it appears that very few capital crimes have ever been perpetrated in that country, although the English laws are more strictly executed than in England itself. The prevalence of crimes in England is owing to the state of society. A villain is more completely concealed in such a great city as London, than he could be in a forest a thousand miles square. The freedom enjoyed in England is one cause of a greater number of

crimes than in many other countries. In France there are many encroachments on personal liberty which are not permitted in England. Even in this country we submit to a search under a general warrant, while the English do not. A great part of all the villains in England flock to London, and there acts of villainy are carried to the highest pitch, as you may see by reading "Colquhoun's Police of London." In that book you may find also much important information relating to crimes and punishments.

In England the greater part of the poor are educated to nothing: but in Scotland it is exactly the opposite. In Scotland, education, a more thin population, a simpler mode of life, and more virtuous habits—not the strictness or severity of punishments—prevent crimes. In Russia punishments are inhumanly severe. The knout is far worse than death outright: but this does not appear to produce the effects of moral preventives and restraints among an intelligent and virtuous people.

Many experiments have been proposed, and some have been made, for the reformation of criminals. In Philadelphia the state prison was believed by many to be an important improvement, and for a time mere confinement in it seemed likely to produce the desired results, without resort to corporal or capital punishments. The first reports from that prison were very flattering: it was stated that of those who had been released, none had returned to their former bad courses; and the rules of the prison were such as to require them to attend divine worship on the Sabbath, to prevent them from having access to evil books, and in short to cut them

off from various sources of corruption so injurious in other places of the kind. The New-York prison is conducted on a plan generally similar. Newgate, the prison of this state, differs in several respects. The Philadelphia plan seemed to promise so much, that I paid particular attention to every step in its progress. But unfortunately it was at length discovered, that the public had too confidently rested in the belief that it was effecting great moral changes upon convicts. In New-York, in spite of all the precautions taken, the prisoners broke out several times. The result of these experiments has been to prove, that thus far the new systems are not calculated to reform offenders.

The state prison of Massachusetts is built of granite, in a very substantial manner, but has no wall about it; and, although it was expected to prove secure, prisoners are occasionally breaking out of it, and are able to learn how to accomplish their escape in a few months after they are committed. In the New-York prison it has been mentioned as a gross evil, that young persons are put into the prison among the old and hardened criminals, from whom they receive regular lectures in villainy, by professors. The facility of obtaining a discharge is also a grievous thing. The Governor of the State released many from the New-York prison, on condition that they should join the army. Such treatment leads villains to set lightly by a sentence, and of course removes much of the restraint which might prevent them from the commission of crimes. Vincent, a notorious villain, who burnt many houses in the city of Albany, showed that he did not apprehend any thing like punishment from being imprisoned at New-York, under

the mild system there adopted. He declared that it was a matter of indifference to him to go to such a prison: where he was sure of being supplied with food and lodging, and being required to work but little.

The experience thus far had, therefore, proves that state prisons will not stop the commission of crimes. I would however try the experiments on the plan of humanity to the utmost. I would have prisons erected on a new plan, I would furnish the convicts with good books to read in their hours of leisure, I would have them hear the preaching of the Gospel, I would separate the young from the old, to prevent their contamination, and I would make thorough and sufficient experiments. No expense should be spared: the object to be attained is of such importance in every point of view, that the cost should be disregarded.

DISPUTE II.

November 4th, 1813.

Question. *Ought Foreign Immigration to be Encouraged?*

Remark 1st. A country which needs foreign immigration, must be, 1st, destitute of the number of inhabitants necessary for its defence; 2d, in want of men of learning; or, 3d, in want of manufacturers. In neither of these respects are we deficient.

Remark 2d. A man is required by hospitality to receive a stranger into his house, and to treat him kindly: but not to make him the head of his family.

Remark 3d. It is the fashion to say "*a means:*" but this I consider bad grammar. "*A mean*" should be used in the singular.

Remark 4th. Our countrymen are prone to be mistaken in the character of the Irish. Many of those who have come to this country have been uneducated and vicious. The condition of the poor in Ireland is exposed to many evils and sufferings. The great landholders, instead of letting their land to persons who will devote their time and labor to its cultivation, put it into the hands of speculators, and they again, in smaller parcels, to other speculators, so that when it is let in small portions to the cultivators, it is burthened with rents which will scarcely allow them any thing for their in-

dustry. The proprietors of the soil are non-residents, flocking to the great cities in Ireland and England, and taking no pains to improve their soil or the inhabitants. The fruits of industry, the capital of the country, are spent at a distance from it, and without benefit to the people, who are also uninfluenced by the intelligence, the example or the exertions of the wealthy and best educated classes. The prejudice against learning at the same time keeps the great body of them out of the reach of the benefits of instruction, and ignorant of the advantages of books and schools. Yet, under all these disadvantages, the Irish have proved themselves equal to their neighbors. Many great men have come from Ireland. Edmund Burke, Lord Wellington, Dr. Goldsmith, Lord Castlereagh, and many others, might be mentioned, who have distinguished themselves in various departments of science and literature. When we look upon a country suffering under so many depressing circumstances, we cannot but feel regret and compassion. But if we are in danger of being injured by the influx of foreigners, we ought not to disguise the truth. Uneducated men can never be desirable citizens in a republic. The people must be instructed, or they will not be able to support the government.

Remark 5th. It is often said that the Americans are making rapid strides towards perfection. We are not making very rapid progress, but I hope more rapid than heretofore.

Remark 6th. The word "factory" has been applied in this country to manufactories. In England a factory means a totally different thing: viz. a trading house, an European company established in the territory of a

foreign power: as the factories in China. Factories have no more to do with manufactories, than they have with making poetry.

Remark 7th. Immigrants, if I had the regulation of the business, should bring undoubted testimony of their good conduct.

The principal encouragements which we might offer to foreigners to settle among us may be supposed to be donations of money, grants of land, and naturalization.

1. Donations of money. By adopting this expedient we should, at a great expense, obtain the worst citizens.

2. By offering grants of land, we draw into our country men who have no strong ties at home, and who are ready to throw off the wholesome restraints to which they are subjected. Some foreigners coming here mistake liberty for licentiousness, and expect to act as they please. By giving them land, we should induce them to assemble together, and to form communities of their own. It is no advantage to us to have bad men forming settlements among us, even if they do it by themselves. Their habits and principles would become the more confirmed and perpetuated. People have often been found to retain the same opinions and prejudices through many generations. Even in towns we find this to be the fact in a very considerable degree, where the early circumstances of society have been unfriendly to intelligence and morality, unless they have been represented as incapacitated by education and habits from tilling the soil

with advantage. Being accustomed to society, they become weary of solitude.

3. Naturalization is the third inducement which we might offer to foreigners, to induce them to settle among us. Rather than practice this, however, I would wait for the natural increase of our own population, if we are really in want of more people.

DECISION.

I shall first consider the arguments which are generally urged in favor of our encouraging immigration.

1. It is said that immigration will increase our population. This point I have already sufficiently examined. We shall increase fast enough by ourselves; and have no need of rapidly filling up our western territory, although it is of importance to land holders to increase the price of their land, and to fill their own pockets.

2. Another argument is, that immigration would improve our language. But in this manner, I observe that we deteriorate it. The language of England is divided into numerous dialects, greatly unlike each other. That of the West Country people would be unintelligible to us. The same may be said of the Northern, Southern, and other counties. In the United States, on the contrary, there is comparatively no difference at all. I can understand perfectly every one of you, though you are from almost every State in the country. Scotch, Irish, Dutch, French, or even English would never purify our language.

It is true that our language is not as much the object of study in this country. Book making is not

made a business here, and while it is not, less attention will be bestowed upon it. But the introduction of foreigners would not introduce the trade of book making as it exists in England. Foreigners would not come here to make books.

3. It is stated that the encouragement of immigration would promote literature and science. These we may class together. With regard to the books necessary for our improvement in science and literature, we can easily obtain them from Europe; and as to learned men, there are very few who could be of any benefit to us, and these must be solicited by particular invitation, and then would not come. We want men of real worth and merit; but such men would be appreciated at home, and could not be obtained without a resort to extraordinary means. There are very few whom we want, and they are truly great men. These could not be influenced by either allowing or encouraging immigration on any general scale. Even if men who had attained reputation in Europe should come to live amongst us, they would lose the incitements to exertion which they feel at home, and be more disposed to live on the honor of their names, than to acquire greater by further progress in knowledge.

4. Another argument used is, that the introduction of foreigners would improve our arts and manufactures. The European manufacturers are doubtless more skillful than we; but the manual part of their skill is in the possession of journeymen, each of whom has been trained to perform a part of a process, and nothing more. They are ignorant of every thing else, and their habits are generally profligate and corrupting.

Such men we do not want among us, but the manufacturers, those who are acquainted with complete branches of business, and are better educated and more virtuous, we can obtain without establishing any general system for the encouragement of immigration.

The arguments on the other side of the question, I arrange under two heads; and these I shall next consider, viz. the effects of such a system in peace and in war.

1. *In peace.* The ill effects which immigration would produce, in a political point of view, are various. Europeans are very ignorant of this country, its inhabitants and their condition, and are greatly prejudiced against us. It has been repeatedly asserted by them that by coming to America every thing deteriorates. One European naturalist says that the Cariboo is the largest native animal of America. (It is in fact as large as a calf a year old.) A few pages beyond, the same writer, in speaking of the Moose, says it is a native of America, and as large as a horse. Buffon gravely gives it as his opinion, that there must be a deficiency of matter in the Western Continent, because there are found eight species of animals which have no tails; while in Europe there are only six. This is a serious matter: but it might appear more so, had not a later naturalist found that there exist in Europe fourteen tailless species. One would think it strange, however, under any circumstances, that a large continent like America could not furnish matter enough for these appendages! How much prejudice there must be to lead men to make such remarks—to draw such conclusions! This is but a specimen of the ignorance and prejudice of many Europeans, on many subjects: yet we are too

apt to be influenced by them, and embrace such views as they entertain. Even when they express the opinion that we are their inferiors, we too readily admit it. This debases our character. I would not encourage pride, young gentlemen; I consider it as the disgrace of man—but I would have you to reverence yourselves and your country.

But we feel local partialities and antipathies which prevent us from possessing a proper national feeling. Our territory is wide, and the inhabitants of distant parts have little more intercourse with each other than if they lived in different countries. We find one man attached to Connecticut or Massachusetts, perhaps to New-England, or New-York, Virginia or Kentucky: but no man is attached to the United States. In our present condition we are divided by two rancorous parties, which direct all their attention towards each other, and forget the general interests in their contest. This does not recommend us to foreigners. Instead of being led away in this manner by our passions, we should remember that there are good men in all parties. These we should acknowledge as countrymen, and confide in them, and elevate them according to their talents.

DECISION CONCLUDED, NOV. 8th.

I was considering the effects which the encouragement of immigration would produce upon the politics of our country in peace.

I will now, in the 2d place, speak of its probable influence *in war*. In Europe they are accustomed to mobs and conspiracies, as well as to ingenious and daring

crimes of all sorts. This requires the establishment of a system of police, extensive and strict beyond all our knowledge in this country. The danger of detection to which criminals are thus constantly exposed under such a scrutiny, and the severity of punishment to which they are liable, would incline many of them to seize upon favorable opportunities to change their residence, for a country where their hazards would be diminished; and if we should hold out other encouragement to them, no doubt we should soon be visited by some of the most dangerous men of London and the other great cities of Europe.

Of what use is it to introduce such men amongst us? Will they render us any benefit? Instead of improving us in morals or national wealth, they bring in pauperism, idleness and vices. Even if we were to suppose Europeans to be more virtuous than ourselves, which they are not, the persons whom they would empty upon us would yet be far less virtuous than the generality of our own countrymen; and we are bad enough. Members of society ought to be orderly people: such men as I have described are disorderly. Mobs are highly dangerous to us: for though the government cannot, if disposed, greatly injure our liberty, mobs can. I have seen several mobs, young gentlemen; and if you were to see one, it would do more to convince you of this truth, than a discussion as long as from here to the water side. In mobs I have seen mild, orderly, sober men, converted into fiends. In Europe, when such disorderly conduct is betrayed by the populace of cities, the government are forced to resort to means to repress it which appear to us intol-

erable: but this is the only way to prevent them. In the countries of Europe there are systems of police which watch with constant care over those who are dangerous to the public peace. In this country such precautions have thus far been unnecessary: but Europe could not rest under such a state of things as ours. Of all the systems of police in the world that of France is the most remarkable and wonderful.

A French merchant was once entering Paris in a stage coach. When it stopped at the gate of the city, an officer informed him that the Lieutenant General of Police wished to speak with him. The merchant replied that he must have mistaken him for some other person, as he was not only unacquainted with the Lieutenant General of Police, but a stranger in Paris. "No," replied the officer, "I am sure I am right: you answer the description exactly." The merchant, who knew that a request of such a nature was tantamount to a command, immediately presented himself to Monsieur Desartine, with the expression of a doubt, however, of his being the person whose presence was desired. "You are the man I sent for," replied he: "are you a man of courage? You are to be murdered to night. You are to lodge in such a room, in such a house, in such a street, in a front apartment in the third story. You have such and such drafts with you, which you keep in your portmanteau. You commonly retire to rest about ten o'clock, after having placed your portmanteau in a chair by your bed side, and your pistols in another. You generally make a practice of looking under your bed and into your closet just before you get into bed." (All this, which he lis-

tened to with the utmost astonishment, was exactly true.) "Are you a man of courage?" (Nothing rouses a Frenchman more than to ask him such a question.) "A plot has been laid to murder you to-night. Will you sleep in that room, or shall I send another man to sleep there?" "I will sleep there," replied the merchant. "Then go," said M. Desartine: "but do not look into your closet, nor under your bed. Be careful also not to fall asleep."

The merchant left the Lieutenant General of Police, and did as he was requested. He lay down without scrutinizing the room as closely as usual, but did not neglect to lay his pistols and portmanteau in their accustomed places. About midnight the door of his apartment opened, and two men entered. He affected to be asleep, but watched them closely, and recognized one of them, who was his own footman. They cautiously approached his bed, drew the charges from his pistols, took his portmanteau into the entry, and then returning held a consultation in what manner they should take his life. At this moment two men rushing from the closet, and two more from under the bed, seized the villains.

Such was the vigilance of the spies, that the whole of this plot, even to its details, had been communicated through them to the head of the police, with so much promptitude and exactness that he was able in this manner to defeat it, and to seize the criminals after allowing them to proceed just far enough to afford the evidence necessary to procure their punishment.

This system of spies extends through all France. And it is not confined to the prevention or punishment

of crime; but, when the government think that it would favor their views if a particular individual were taken out of the way, that person is watched; two or three gens d'armes, without any disturbance at all, put him on horseback, and his friends never hear of him again. The police spies are in the closets, the private apartments, and the desks of every gentleman in France. And this system, so widely spread, so expensive, and so terrible, is the product of a corrupt state of society, in which men are prepared for crime and for intrigues against the government, and find great opportunities to carry their designs into effect.

Society in Europe is exposed to the operation of demoralizing influences, which do not affect our own country in any considerable degree. The books of France are full of vice, as gross as we can possibly imagine. Books, songs, &c. of the most demoralizing tendency, are printed and hawked about every where in the greatest profusion. They are scattered by pedlars, who take them to academies, colleges and schools, and place them in the hands of youth of both sexes, for the sole purpose of polluting them.

Now, by encouraging immigration, we shall bring all these evils upon ourselves. Nations are always descending the hill of turpitude, and advancing fast towards the bottom. Why then should we introduce into our country men who have been corrupted more than ourselves, to hasten our descent? It is untimely to have this deluge come upon us now. My prejudice is not against foreigners: but against the vices of foreigners. The Europeans are undoubtedly most corrupt, most advanced in iniquity.

After a view of the subject such as I have given you, I have come to the conclusion, that I would not encourage immigration. Still, I would not refuse proper privileges to such persons as we might admit among us with benefit, or without injury to ourselves. I would oblige every person who might desire naturalization, to produce the best testimonials of his character and condition as they were before he left his own country. If these should prove to be such as we should wish him to sustain here, I think he should be naturalized: otherwise not. This, in my opinion, is the only way in which we can avoid the vices and the ruin which would be brought upon us if we should naturalize indiscriminately all who come, or, as some say, offer to immigrants of all sorts land, money, and even offices in the government, to induce them to take up their abode among us.

DISPUTE III.

November 9th, 1813.

Question. *Ought the Liberty of the Press to be Restricted?*

Remark 1st. Blackstone says very prettily, and like a good man, yet falsely, that the liberty of the press is essential to a free government. Rome had not a free press; and Greece had not: yet they were free. This shows us, that we should not take for granted what every great and good man asserts.

Remark 2d. The unrestrained liberty of the press was one of the principal causes of the French Revolution. Infidel books were published and distributed every where at a very cheap rate, for the propagation of falsehood, and the corruption of the public sentiments and morals; and by them the minds of the French were prepared for all the enormities which they afterwards committed. Those who pursued this plan of operation by the press, did not confine their views to France or even to Europe. At the same period a whole cargo of Paine's *Age of Reason* was poured into Philadelphia. What could not be sold were given away, as the great object was to get them into extensive circulation. If works like these which corrupted France were to be freely published in this country: give the American press such liberty, and the nation is un-

done. Moral corruption is fatal to any people. The wars which we have had, and those which we might have, would prove far less destructive.

DECISION.

This question has been debated much by wise and good men. The truth is, the press is power, and power may be abused. It may, on the contrary, be directed wholly to good and useful purposes. The press is always mischievous in such cases as those in which the tongue is mischievous: when used to oppose virtue, to recommend vice, to propagate falsehood and error. Some would give unrestrained freedom to the press, under the belief that any slander which may be devised may be combatted, proved to be such, and rendered ineffectual. But it is certain that slander, once originated, will to a considerable extent be believed: there is a propensity in man to receive it as truth. Besides, we cannot always make the correction of a slander follow the slander itself. With regard to the dissemination of falsehoods and false opinions, if they are to be freely circulated in society, they may be seen and believed by persons who will never meet with the refutation of them. Others may see the refutation and not believe it. Positive and serious evil then may flow from the unrestrained liberty of the press. That such evils exist in society, arising from the dissemination of slander with the tongue, and that they would arise from the improper use of the press must be allowed. That power exists in the press—the power of doing good and harm, must also be allowed. Power in the hands of bad men has been very injurious, and to them it

should never be trusted, without placing upon them the best checks we can. We cannot dispense with governments: we must commit power to somebody, and therefore expose it to abuse. To guard against the evil propensities of bad men, we must therefore limit their authority, or render them responsible for the manner in which they use it. The press is power of one kind, and, it is said on one side, should be guarded in a similar manner. The question is important; and the experience of different countries may be instructive to us. If the restriction of the liberty of the press is calculated to prevent the evils apprehended, we must look for them chiefly in nations where it is free; and the best way to decide the question is, to look into the cases of different countries where different courses have been adopted in regard to the press.

France is incomparably more licentious than Great Britain. In the former country the press is not free: in the latter it is. Holland and Switzerland, before their late ruin, were very virtuous countries, and there the press had not been restrained. On the other hand, the evils apprehended have not arisen from the freedom of the press in those countries where it has existed; and if they were the natural consequence of it, they would have been seen to be so. The truth is, there is more licentiousness where the press is restricted than where it is free.

Notwithstanding the necessary evils arising from an unrestrained press, I think it is, on the whole, no injury to a community. You may remark that it is seldom the case that a good man goes to the grave with a bad character, or a bad man with a good character.

The falsehood circulated by the press does not become generally and extensively injurious, because it does not obtain general or lasting belief. I never saw a worse collection of slander than was written against General Washington; and yet his character stands high every where. He will always be ranked with Alfred, the two Gustavuses, Louis the Good and a variety of other good men.

The present emperor of France will not go to the grave with a good character. Notwithstanding all the power with which Napoleon is surrounded, he will be detested; and his character will be known after that power has departed from him.

But how would the restriction of the press ensure its purity? Licentious rulers would have licentious men to control it. They would give or refuse licenses of publication in every case; and the consequence would be, that many good books would thus be kept back while many bad ones would be put forward. Now whenever a bad book comes into the world, where the press is free, an answer follows it very soon. But if there were no liberty of publication, whenever a bad book appeared, as it often would when the rulers were bad, every reply to it, every exposure of its fallacy or falsehood, would be suppressed by the same rulers who promoted the evil, and it would be impossible to counteract its effect. So long as their power lasted the reply would be prevented from appearing: it might be for twenty years;—and then the principal influence of the book would be over.

Although great evils, therefore, attend the liberty of the press, I see no way to remedy them without sacri-

ficing more than we gain. The only restriction which I would lay upon the press would be this: that every publisher should put his name to his writings. I do not know that this would be a successful experiment: but I should try it.

DISPUTE IV.

Question. *Does the Mind always Think?*

Remark 1st. I doubt whether men who think most dream most. It would appear from Locke's treatment of this subject, that he did not dream much. It often happens that men of strong feelings, whether they think much or not, dream much. The best way to determine this point would be to mark the facts; and after we have got a sufficient number, to compare them.

Remark 2d. It must be remembered that our ignorance proves nothing. Infidels have brought ignorance as an argument against Christianity: but the mere fact that we do not know any thing is no proof that it does not exist. This argument is not worth a pinch of snuff.

Remark 3d. It is often the case, that when we are about to speak, we forget what we were going to say. Is it not easy then to forget when we are asleep; and may it not be that we have many dreams which we never remember?

DECISION.

Mr. Locke's arguments in respect to this subject are the following: That during sleep we are not conscious

of thought; that the mind is always active even without our knowledge; [I would remark, that "being unconscious of thought" means nothing, unless that we do not remember what our thoughts have been;] that we have no ideas but those derived from sensation and reflection; that no one can know whether a person thinks in his sleep except himself, [that is, no one can know it if the sleeper himself does not.] This is not true. A man may walk in his sleep without knowing it; and another man may see him walking, and doing other things which involve thought, and thus ascertain to a certainty that the sleeper thinks, while he himself is ignorant of it. Of this there are many proofs in fact.

A physician living at Lamberton, in New-Jersey, found to his great surprise on waking one morning that he was without a shirt, and was unable to discover any trace of it after searching his room. Having dressed himself and made particular inquiries, he was obliged to remain in doubt with regard to the cause of this singular occurrence. On the following morning, however, he found himself in a similar predicament, and was obliged to furnish himself as before, without the power of making a discovery. The same thing happened the three following days, so that five of his shirts had at last thus mysteriously disappeared. The matter had now become so wonderful that his brother determined to sleep with him, and ascertain, if possible, the cause of it. In the night the physician rose from bed without speaking, and left the room. His brother, who was on the watch, hurried on a few clothes and followed him. The former took his way towards the Delaware, where, on his arrival, he prepared to bathe;

and placing his shirt in a hole, leaped into the water. After swimming for some time, he regained the shore, proceeded homeward, without stopping for his garment, and went to bed. The brother followed, being convinced he was asleep, and took his place again beside him in bed without waking him. The next day, on examining the hole on the river's bank, the six shirts were found, where their owner had deposited them, unconscious, or forgetful of every thing he had done.

In another case of which I have heard, there was still greater evidence of thought during sleep, of which the agent was equally ignorant. A shoemaker's wife was one night awakened by her husband's rising in his sleep and preaching a sermon of some length. At the close of it he gave notice, that on the following evening he should deliver another discourse; and this he did with such gravity, that she invited several of her neighbors to attend. They came on the evening appointed, and were gratified with his sermon, as well as with the renewal of the appointment on the next Thursday evening, which he remembered as before. Thus he continued to preach once a week, and in a manner which his audience were gratified with, until the secret was accidentally divulged to him, and that put an end to it. The probability is, that this man could not have formed a sermon at all in his waking hours.

An eminent lawyer once told me, that having a difficult case to argue, after having devised several different methods for managing it, he dreamt out one at night, which on the following morning he recollected, and

preferred to the others so much that he adopted it in court.

The imagination is undoubtedly stronger during sleep than when we are awake.

While I lived in Northampton, I was engaged for a time to supply a winter society, as it is called: that is, an assembly meeting for public worship in a part of the town distant from the church. One night I dreamt of preaching to them, and chose rather a singular text. It was this: "Then answered the High Priest, ye know nothing at all." When I awoke, I remembered the whole of the sermon, and it was of such a nature that I determined to write it: but being much occupied for several days, and having soon begun to forget it, I was persuaded that I should not do it justice, and gave it up.

On the question before us, we feel the want of facts. A great deal of useful knowledge is lost by inexcusable neglect. We ought to take our note books and pencils with us wherever we go, and write down every thing we see which we think will be worth remembering. What we should thus collect would have an advantage over every thing we could find in books: it is real knowledge.

Upon the whole, I do not know that the soul always thinks. For some reasons I think it probable. Mr. Locke's arguments to prove the negative of this question are very fallacious.

Dr Alex. concludes from analogy that it does

DISPUTE V.

November 16, 1813.

Question. *Is a public education preferable to a private?*

DECISION.

THIS question may be considered in two points of view: 1st. Which is more beneficial to the community? 2d. Which to the youth themselves?

The universal practice and experience of nations who have paid any attention to the instruction of the young, will decide the former of these questions. An apparatus is indispensably necessary for instruction in various departments of knowledge; but it is so expensive that it cannot be purchased by ordinary parents. Of course, if education were made private, many would be deprived of the benefit of apparatus.

Without going far into the first question, we may consider the second. Combined exertions are powerful. It is stated that a man working alone may make about a dozen pins in a day, while ten men together, each of whom has a particular part of the work to perform, will make ten thousand. The same principle may be extended to almost every branch of human business, and, among others, to that of instruction. One teacher cannot be as perfect a master of all branches of knowledge as he might be of one. It is therefore ne-

cessary, in order to have good instructors, that one person should be assigned to each department in science. It is necessary also that he be supported by some means, so that his time may be appropriated to his studies and his instructions. But this cannot be done by individuals, and of course the university must offer advantages superior to private instruction. To render the latter equal to the former, the private family must be supplied with professors as capable as those of the public institution, which cannot be done.

With respect to morals, which is the foundation of one objection made to public instruction, it is to be remembered that there are many youth who are corrupted before they come to college. These seek the company of the virtuous whom they find there, and seduce them. This is an evil of a most serious nature. The youth who come hither with pure habits, are not acquainted with the characters of those who appear to seek their society with friendly feelings, and sometimes fall their prey. Persons of worth wait to be sought for: the vicious are in a hurry to find company. Solitude is an enemy to vice. But similar evils exist in other places beside public institutions. The best thing that happens to many youth is their leaving their father's house. What some need is to be separated from the companions they have had in their childhood. Servants in the house are often great corrupters of children.

It is objected to universities, that they allow youth to become acquainted with evil which they might be kept from at home. A gentleman once asked me whether I suffered my children to read the books of in-

fidels. I told him yes: for they must become acquainted with them sooner or later, and while I am living I can confute the arguments they use. I should be unwilling to have them find these arguments unawares, with nobody by to meet them. So with respect to vices. Men must become acquainted with their existence sooner or later, and it is desirable that they should have examples and motives of virtue before them at the same time.

The following is the plan which I would approve for the private education of children. I would select about a dozen youths of steady habits: industrious and moral, who should be under my special care. I would say to their parents, as General Kutusoff said to the Emperor of Russia when appointed by him to take command of the troops against Bonaparte: "Your Majesty will not appear in the army yourself!" I would have all the superintendence of them. The children should be placed where they could have no intercourse with vicious persons, unless under the eye of their instructors. They should not be excluded from the world, but be from time to time permitted to mingle with well-bred and respectable company. When at the age of fifteen, or thereabouts, they should travel, accompanied by some proper person, and be obliged to note down every thing they saw or heard worthy of remembrance. So many hours should be set apart for study, and so many for exercise, which should not be infringed upon. I would carefully instill into their minds that all I did was intended for their good, and would render myself as agreeable to them as possible. All the useful branches of knowledge I would teach

them in due season, while botany and mineralogy should be made part of their recreation in their leisure hours.

Such a plan as this I should like to see pursued: but it never was and never will be done.

DISPUTE VI.

November 17th, 1813.

Question. *Are the Abilities of the sexes equal?*

Remark 1st. The mother gives the first turn and cast to the mind. Her province is infinitely more valuable than that of the father. General Washington's mother contributed to the foundation of his character. Sir William Jones's mother performed the same important part in the education of her son.

Remark 2d. Mrs. Hannah More has written better on the human character, than any man whose writings I have seen. Her treatise on female education is as far superior to that of Mr. Locke, as his is to that of an ordinary man. Her system of morals is the best in the world.

Remark 3d. It does not appear that bodily and mental strength go parallel. I have seen many strong men with strong minds; but I have seen many who were strong in mind, but weak in body. Dr. Johnson was strong it is true. He knocked down a bookseller with a book. Governor Strong of Massachusetts could probably be outrun by most of the butchers in the state.

DECISION.

There can be no decision on this subject, because the different manner of educating the different sexes

deprives us of facts. Mr. Kirkland, a missionary to the Indians, informed me, that one of the Iroquois tribes had a woman who was considered the most able counsellor among them.

It is owing to the innate good sense of the women of this country, that they are not absolute idiots. I would not give three groats to have a daughter of mine go to many of the schools in the country. Observe the state of our schools for females, and compare them with the colleges for males. The seminaries for females are no better than hired school rooms; and how disproportioned are the benefits of instruction offered in the two plans of instruction? Yet under all these advantages in the one case, and disadvantages in the other, we are comparing the abilities of the sexes. The end kept in view in our institutions for the education of males, is to make them useful: in that of females, to make them admired. Men will pay any thing to have their daughters taught to manage their feet in dancing, to daub over a few pictures, &c. to be admired by a few silly young men. I cannot speak on this subject without indignation.

In spite of all the disadvantages under which they suffer, females have not only become good, (which they have done oftener than men,) but great. Elizabeth was better than any other sovereign that ever sat on the English throne, except Alfred the Great. Catharine of Russia, though in some respects bad, was better than the other monarchs of that country. Margaret of Denmark was great. Women on thrones have generally excelled men in that station. What a miserable collection of kings have set upon the thrones of Eng-

land, France, Spain, and other countries of Europe! It has been said that Elizabeth's character is due to the wisdom of her ministers. Their wisdom only shows that she had sagacity enough to choose such ministers. In literature woman can appear to great advantage. No writer has equalled Mrs. More on the subjects she has handled.

In determining this question we are prone to be prejudiced. We are like the man who showed a lion a statue of a man treading upon a lion's neck, to prove to him the superiority of his own species. "Ah!" said the lion, "let us be painters, and we will soon show you a lion with a man at his feet."

But females excel us in moral excellence. In comparison with this, even good sense and enlarged intelligence are mere frippery. Women are much more frequently persons of piety than men. Their dependent situation is favorable to it. It may be set down as a strong probability, that many more women than men will go to heaven.

DISPUTE VII.

Question. *Which have the greatest influence in forming a National Character, Moral or Physical Causes?*

Remark 1st. Civilization commenced earliest in the temperate climates.

Remark 2d. We are too apt to make short syllables. Many say *intrigue*, which is wrong, because words ending in *gue* have the last syllable long.

Remark 3d. Some writers attribute all the traits of different nations to their climates. The French and Italians are volatile; the English, Dutch, Turks, and Spaniards are grave. Where is the climate which produces either volatility or gravity? If the Greeks had reason to suppose the air of the ocean peculiarly favorable to the production of great minds, why were Epaminondas, Pindar and others possessed of them?

Remark 4th. It is a prevailing opinion, that the Egyptians gave origin to the sciences and arts. This we believe because the Greeks said it. But the Greeks for a long time knew nothing beyond Egypt, and it was therefore natural that they should embrace such a belief. The truth however is, that the Egyptians brought their sciences from the East. Science sprung up in the antediluvian world; and thence they derived the zodiac, an

alphabet and the theorem of the precession of the equinoxes. We commonly think our arithmetical figures are Arabic: but they are Hindoo; and, if we could trace them, probably we should find them Persian.

Remark 5th. There are many evidences to show that the influence of climate upon national character has been overrated. The Russians have shown that courage may grow in the cold. Peter the Great seems to have been a genius, but a bad man. He had self-denial, industry, and many other necessary qualities; but he kept his eye upon the great thing of being a great monarch. Gustavus Vasa was a good man. The only fault in him worthy of mention, was his being at times ardent almost to rashness. He did not sufficiently consider the importance of his own life.

Remark 6th. In prose, the word "scanty" should be used, and not "scant."

Remark 7th. The government of a country has a great influence upon the national character. Under an extensive government, in process of time, we find the same national character existing in all parts; while under different governments contiguous parts differ.

Remark 8th. Hume, though sagacious, was a bad definer.

Remark 9th. Climate, soil, local situation, &c. are physical causes: education, government, &c. are moral causes. Moral causes are those produced by our own agency: physical, those produced by the agency of God. Moral and physical causes both present motives. The Spartans were hardy: why? Was the climate the cause? No: but the government. Religion has a pow-

erful influence upon national character. The same religion produces similar characters among different nations.

Remark 10th. *Prŏgress* should not be pronounced *prōgress*: *mĭschievous* should not be pronounced *mischiēvous*.

Remark 11th. Physical causes are favorable to the growth of a nation just as they strengthen the body; but moral causes, I conclude, have the greater influence.

Remark 12th. Some people regard with a kind of reverence those countries which in past days have produced great nations, as if there were something in the climate or the soil superior to any thing to be found elsewhere. The same water now washes the shores of Greece as in ancient times, and the same sun now warms it as in the first ages: we should expect then that the same character would exist among the inhabitants at the present day. But their degeneracy in point of learning shows their want of the education which was bestowed upon their predecessors.

Remark 13th. As to the opinions expressed by Europeans concerning our character, capacity, and prospects, there never was a story more perfectly ridiculous among all those that begin with "Once there was a man."

DECISION.

Perhaps this question can never be decided by one general proposition. Moral causes, no doubt, have great influence on mankind; and it can never be denied that physical causes have sometimes much to do in forming

the national character of a people. Yet in my mind no doubt exists, that moral causes have most influence.

Soil operates upon man as a motive, by presenting or by withholding motives. The Arabs cannot very well be different from what they are while they live in their own country. A Greenlander is compelled by his climate to hunt for his food, smoke it when he has obtained it, take up his abode in caves or huts, and in short to live much as he does live. His very condition in that frozen country drives him along the road in which we find him travelling. He has his whole time occupied in keeping warm and getting food; and has no leisure left to found schools or colleges, build churches, towns or cities, or to expand in any way. He would, no doubt, if transplanted to another country, do as other people do who live in it; but while he remains at home he will necessarily be much as he is.

Location has a great influence on the character of a people. An Island possesses many advantages. Upon terra-firma men can generally make but few exertions without coming into collision with each other, breeding contests, and suffering injuries. A sense of weakness renders nations jealous and inimical; and an exposed frontier between two adjacent nations weakens both. The intervention of the sea, on the contrary, in many cases renders both more secure, while it offers an easy and comparatively a safe channel for intercourse with more distant regions.

These are some of the influences exercised by climate, soil, and location, which are among the physical causes affecting nations. The Greeks were at one

period poets, warriors, and historians: why are they not so now? The reason is found in the want of those motives which were formerly held out to them, and which excited them to exertion. In ancient times, when great rewards were offered to those who excelled in learning, eloquence, the arts and war, there were always found men enough who were eager to exert all their energies in different professions, and to labor for life to the utmost of their power. By such application and exertions the ancients attained their excellence, and they could have attained it by no other means. Just so it is in every other country, and in all circumstances where excellence is attained in any thing. Sufficient motives are held out for the encouragement of exertion; and not such motives as may be felt by only one or two individuals, but so great as to influence many who will exhilarate each other, and bring into full operation the greatest talents. When Newton shone so bright in philosophy, he was not alone: there was a whole constellation of philosophers. Sufficient motives will always produce great excellence. When David wanted great warriors he found them: not only the first three, but the thirty.

The reason why savages remain uncivilized, and attached to their barbarous state, is that they see no motives to induce them to improve. Mankind are powerfully influenced by the love of distinction; and this is true in all states of society. Savages are distinguished in the chase, in council and in war, and in no other way. Place them in such circumstances that they would have an honorable distinction in becoming civilized, and you will soon see them becoming civi-

lized. This you will compass at once if you can give them a love for property. The Chinese live under a despotism, which offers few motives and shuts out all others. The consequence is, they are just what other men would be if placed under the same circumstances. They are much raised above the savage state, and have the love of property, and are tenacious of it in a greater degree than most other people. They will let you kick and cuff them like spaniels, and laugh at you all the while, if they think they have the prospect of cheating you out of a little money. Still their love for property leads them to no further progress in civilization. They remain where they have long been, for the want of motives to induce them further to improve. Louis the Fourteenth was a despot: but he wanted to rule over men; and therefore his subjects were in desirable circumstances. Other sovereigns have also sometimes offered encouragements or motives to men to improve their own condition; and in Great Britain more than in any other part of Europe. There you have a religion not forced down the throats of men by violence, but recommended by reason. Religion there holds a high rank in public estimation: so much so that when individuals have not been truly religious, they have shown by their conduct that they thought it good, and that they believed it right and becoming in them to show an outward respect for it. Those who act upon this principle, sometimes also acquire the inward spirit of religion. In that country arts have risen to an eminence, and have greatly flourished. The political condition of the people, in conjunction with their religion, also yields them great benefits. All the offices

in the state, except the king's, are open to any individual; and this produces an effect upon many persons in different conditions in society. Though a distant object, it is ever an active one, in its influence upon those who are pursuing studies which may put them in the way of promotion: it calls forth their energy and industry. The improvements we there see —the progress made in science and the arts—are not the results of what is sometimes in this country called genius, which is like Egypt, a broken reed: it is the cultivation of the mind, the manure, which raises the plant, and makes it overtop the whole forest.

We find the traces of the power of motives whereever we turn. In England land produces forty, fifty, and sixty bushels of wheat to an acre. In this country the common crops are seven, eight and fifteen. What is the reason of this? In England agriculture is much respected; and when extraordinary success is obtained by science or skill, the result is thought important, the attention of men is attracted by it, the land which has yielded much is visited and the novelty is talked of and admired. And so it is with other branches of useful industry. Manufacturers who exhibit great proficiency and produce great results sometimes become great men.

In this country, on the contrary, sufficient motives are not offered to encourage men to make exertions in many of those departments in which we ought to be better skilled. The great fault with us is fault-finding; feelings are too local, and animosities too strong. The inhabitants of our principal cities feel but little interest or attachment for each other. The citizens of New-York, Charleston, Baltimore, Boston, and Philadelphia

care but litttle for what is beyond their own cities. Even what we know we are inclined to condemn. We crow upon our own dunghills, and set up our feathers wonderfully against those who attempt to crow upon the neighboring dunghills.

A change of circumstances will sometimes produce a striking change in the feelings and condition of a nation, by offering new motives to incite them. The chain has been taken off the minds of the Spaniards by the abolition of the Inquisition. The people feel it: and in your life time they will probably do great things. If they now had a sovereign whose ambition was not to cook his own breakfast or to kill a deer, they probably would have risen from their degraded state.

DISPUTE VIII.

November 24th, 1813.

Question. *Is a Lie ever Justifiable?*

Remark 1st. It is no argument in favor of lying that some of the best men mentioned in Scripture lied. We find that numbers of them were guilty of other sins, which are in like manner recorded, and sometimes without any comment on their criminality, which is so plain as to require none. Their example in the one case is no more a justification of those who imitate them than in the other.

Remark 2d. Dr. Paley speaks of what he calls "white lies;" but depend upon it, they are "white-washed," and if you get that off, you will find them as black as any other.

[The decision must be deferred, as I have something to say to you on another subject.]

The tutors tell me, young gentlemen, that you make too much noise in the hall. I wish to turn your attention to this subject early, that you may correct your manners there in due season. I have observed that disorder in college almost always begins in that place. There you are frequently collected together, and have opportunities to do many things without being particularly overlooked. When a youth begins to deviate

from strict propriety, he usually first breaks a law of no great importance, before he proceeds to commit great offences. The progress towards the gallows is gradual; and so it is in ill conduct at this college. A student indulges in some petty misbehavior, and step by step increases in the course of disobedience till he brings severe punishment upon himself.

You will observe that the laws of Yale College are very mild, and that every precaution has been used in framing them to prevent the necessity of severe punishment, though still sometimes it is found necessary. Great labor has been bestowed in improving them, so that their operation might be as gentle, just, and salutary as possible. They were originally copied, with some variations, from those of the Universities of Cambridge and Oxford, and were founded on the principle that every offence was to be cured by the infliction of a penalty. Numerous fines were imposed, which were formerly collected from those students who infringed the rules. They have been considerably altered within a few years, and for the better: for the system has been changed for the parental, which is calculated to prevent the commission of crimes by moral influences, rather than to punish them when committed. I have exerted myself much to procure the mollification of the old rules as I considered them too severe, and not suitable to the ends proposed by laws. One consideration is, that the smaller instances of misconduct in the young, often proceed not from a disposition to do hurt, but from high spirits. Of these I am not disposed to think too gravely, nor am I inclined to punish them too severely. They are however not to be disregarded: they form the first

link in the chain: it is best to prevent the greater evils to which they lead, by beginning early. I know the tendency of such things, and I have apprehensions of the result if they are allowed to proceed without check. You will not be apt to watch against things which in themselves may be of little or no importance: but, if you do not, you will by degrees arrive at greater and greater offences, and find yourselves farther and farther removed from the line of uprightness.

As I have before remarked, the great and most serious disorders here, generally begin in the hall; and the first intimation of evil generally is an unusual noise among the students while at their meals. Whatever is the reason, it is true, that whenever any thing is designed to be prevented from hurting the conscience, noise is resorted to. Mobs are always noisy. Noise in all instances accompanies wrong, except in cases in which concealment is necessary to the perpetrator. But noise is unbecoming you while employed at your meals. You would not make it at a gentleman's table: why do you not consider your tutors and your friends as gentlemen? Stillness is as much a law in civilized countries, as any statute made by legislators.

Your class entered college young, and therefore, as a class, had much volatility. But you are now old enough, and high enough in rank, to conduct with propriety and to act without noise. And you ought to consider also your influence: your example, if an example of order and propriety, will have a great effect upon the other classes, who will ever be observing your conduct. They will feel themselves justified, or at least excused, in doing what they see you do. Al-

though you have not all been as remarkable for good conduct as would have been desirable, you have it in your power to conduct as well in the hall as you do here; and I have no fault to find with your manners in my presence, with the exception of a little whispering now and then among some of you, which shows the remains of the boy. In the concerns of the senior class I always feel a particular interest, as it is under my more immediate care, and take great pleasure in having them conduct according to the strictest rules of propriety. I cannot but hope, therefore, that you will prove hereafter, that all your former volatility does not afford a just criterion for your minds, but that you can think and act soberly.

If, however, you should practice the opposite behavior, would not the effect of it in future be painful as well as injurious? Would it not hurt your feelings to reflect, that you had contributed to destroy the character of a fellow student, and to injure the happiness of a parent?

If you wish to pursue the course of wisdom, attend seriously to this subject now, for it has been timely introduced that you may check the beginning of evil. The disturbances which have been known here have generally had one beginning. After the students have been for some time noisy in the hall, they have next begun to throw bread, break vessels, overset tables, and then proceeded to bold and daring offences and crimes, which have procured their dismission. The danger of such disgrace and evil may easily be avoided by a little reflection at the outset.

These arguments, young gentlemen, I should think sufficient to convince an opponent: but I hope I have no opponents here. I hope I speak to friends.

DECISION. NOV. 26th, 1813.

It is remarkable that Dr. Paley has said that some falsehoods are not lies. The parables of Christ, although not true stories, were far from being falsehoods, because they were not intended to be believed. And this is an important point to be settled, in relation to every question concerning deception and truth-telling; to which Paley pays no regard. He says that there is no deception involved in servants denying that their masters are at home, when they are not disposed to see company. But the intention is to deceive the friend; and the fact that the visit is not of very great consequence, or that the practice is common, does not change the nature of the thing. The writing of "Your Humble Servant" at the close of a letter to one whom you are not disposed to serve, and whom you perhaps regard as an enemy rather than a friend, is not however intended to be believed, as it is always understood to mean nothing. The plea of "Guilty" or "Not Guilty" by a prisoner at the bar is not a falsehood, because it is not understood as declaring his guilt or innocence, but only his wish to avoid or to stand a trial. All sciences have their particular terms; and this is the language of law. On the other hand I do not agree with others in the opinion that it is right for a lawyer to declare his confidence in the justice of his client's cause, when he believes him to be in the wrong. I differ from Paley also in the conclusion I draw from the fact he asserts, that "some persons have no right to know the truth." This does not prove that we have a right to lie. When a child who feels a great antipathy to medicines is sick, and it is ne-

cessary for its life that some should be administered, I am decidedly of the opinion that we cannot be justified in telling it a falsehood. I say we ought to trust to God. One of my children, when severely sick, and likely to die, on a particular occasion could not be prevailed on to take any thing: from his dislike to medicine, fearing that it might be mixed with every thing, he rejected whatever was given to him to eat. So resolute was he indeed, that he would not take the juice of strawberries, of which he was remarkably fond. At length, however, he consented to eat, and did eat, though no deception whatever was attempted upon him. I think few cases will occur more desperate than this apparently was; and, although we may presume a stronger one, I should be unwilling to break moral rules, merely to make way for circumstances of my own supposition.

Paley says also, that it is justifiable to deceive a madman, to bring about a benevolent purpose. I would not do it, and I think it would not often be necessary to practice a deception for such objects, but that they might generally be obtained by harmless means. If a madman, while in pursuit of a person he designed to kill, should enquire of me the way that person had taken, instead of deceiving him, I think I should try to divert him from his purpose. No one can foresee exactly what effect may be produced upon the mind of a madman by a diversion of his thoughts from one subject to another; and instances have been known in which they have been made to relinquish evil intentions in an instant, by encountering something unexpectedly. A madman, greatly infuriated against his family, was once met by a man whom he held in high respect, while bent on

their destruction. He immediately resolved to put him to death, and told the man that such was his intention. The other replied in a cool and unshaken manner: "What! you will not kill me?" This produced another change in his mind, and he immediately replied:—"No, I will not!"

Another of Paley's remarks is, that in some cases the general evil produced by telling a falsehood is very small, and the particular good very great, and that in such circumstances truth should be sacrificed. But I believe that the truth can never be justly violated on this account, nor on any other. I take it that the lawgiver only is to make exceptions to his own law. This is particularly true of God. None but he can make exceptions to the law of truth. His laws are made with a perfect knowledge of the nature of all time and all beings. He knows what will be best not only during the existence of this world, beyond which human laws do not extend, but throughout eternity; and therefore, knowing the tendency of falsehood, he has forbidden it entirely. If we would obey his law, then, we must oppose ourselves to falsehood as he does, and make no limitations to its requisitions. His authority is supreme and unquestionable: we have no right to make any question about expediency when his commands are known. His authority arises from his being the Creator. What right can a creature have to pretend to more wisdom, holiness, or goodness, than the Almighty? What business can we have to say: "You will permit me to make exceptions to your general law of lying?" Such we are not authorized to make; and, unless we

can find exceptions made by himself to his own law, we can make none.

It is then an important question for us to determine: Has God made exceptions? Some maintain that because good men mentioned in the Scriptures are represented as having violated the truth, as they are held up to us for our examples, we are justified in imitating them in this respect. But this is not a right view of the case. The Scriptures present facts: they do not profess to offer any human character as perfect. On the contrary they declare that there is no human perfection. Solomon says: "There is none that doeth good and sinneth not." St. Paul says to the Corinthians: "Follow me so far as I follow Christ." Why should we follow good men in doing wrong? The sins of men whose lives we find recorded in the Bible, are held up for our warning. Good men have been guilty of falsehood, and these are what we are warned to avoid. Josiah, Rebecca, and Rahab were guilty of sins; and there are not a few instances recorded in which falsehoods were told. But there was certainly more liability in those days for those who intended to do their duty to fall into such sins by mistake, than in our own. There were then no written Scriptures accessible to all, with warnings held out in the bad examples of others. The people at large were bad moralists; and if it is doubted by some persons now, whether falsehoods are not in certain cases justifiable, how much more room was there to form such an opinion then. How much less exposed to error are we, and how much more inexcusable when we fall into it! When there were no Scriptures, it is

not wonderful that some should have doubted of a point which a divine of the eighteenth century doubted of, with the Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments in his hands.

It is sufficient that God has said: "Liars shall have their part in the lake that burneth with fire and brimstone!" It shows what is the view in which he regards the subject of our discussion. In the opinion of David, falsehood was more dangerous than the enemies by whom Judea was attacked. In other ages and countries it has been found to be a most destructive evil. It is my own opinion that the French government have done more by falsehood than by arms. The success of their designs has been attributable more to this cause: for before they have invaded a country and attempted its subjugation, they have corrupted the people by infusing into them their principles. I have paid more attention to this subject, I have studied it more than you possibly can have done: I have watched their progress and have examined a history of their government as given by themselves. Their great system was a system of falsehood. The countries they gained possession of were betrayed. The weapon they made use of was the most efficacious ever used. Things have more recently changed, since they have come into contact with people whom they have not been able to corrupt; and the consequence is, that instead of being always victorious, they are now constantly beaten. They have derived a higher character than they deserved from their success; but they formerly brought into the field a greater number of men than their enemies, and the countries they gained were usually betrayed.

With regard to truth we must take firm ground. The government of God could not stand if he allowed lying. If God were to disregard the truth, we should not know but that what he forbade would be what he would reward: no confidence could be placed in him. No bad government could stand except on lying; and no good one could stand if it were to be allowed. It would not be half so great a calamity to the universe to have the world annihilated, as to have God lie. It is indeed impossible that he should lie, as the Scriptures declare. It may be asked how this can be so, since we can lie who have far less power than he. The answer is, that he cannot, because it is so incompatible with his character, the mind of God is infinitely set against it—with such an infinite momentum, that it cannot come into contact with it. This arises entirely from his hatred to it. He hates lying; and he will hate it in us. He is utterly against it. Where then is there room for lying?

But it is said by some that falsehood may in some cases produce good, and therefore that it is not only excusable, but justifiable. God does all for good; and because he sees that falsehood is evil in all its forms, he has forbidden it utterly and in all circumstances. He sees and understands the nature of every thing better than we can, and the nature of lying he perfectly comprehends. So evident is its character in most cases, that we can perceive to what it leads. We can better see and more clearly understand the nature of lying, than of most other subjects which come under our view. Truth is a mathematical quantity. It presents a distinct object to the mind. The sin lies in the intent, and every body

knows whether he lies intentionally or not. This is a point on which we cannot be mistaken: it is a matter of intuitive knowledge. Some sins and their opposite virtues are difficult to be distinguished from each other; but falsehood is as far from truth as the east is from the west: they are infinitely distant from one another. There can be no justifying of falsehood: it is at war with the good of society, and opposed to the government of God. We can conjecture what would be the effect of falsehood, if spread in the other world. The inhabitants of heaven could have no confidence in each other, and confidence is necessary to love and harmony. In this world the effects of falsehood on a small scale are most injurious. "When truth is fallen in the streets, how can equity enter?" If falsehood were allowed, how would virtues of any kind produce their effect? Is not truth the light in which justice must be seen? If misrepresented, justice appears injustice; and if any other virtue be depicted in colors the opposite of its own, it seems a vice.

And falsehood is of such a nature, that it must be guarded against even in its smallest degrees. The slightest deviation from truth is lying; and when the truth has been violated once, it is much more exposed to be violated again. The example of falsehood is extremely pernicious: for falsehood will spread by the fact that it has spread. When a character for lying has been once established, truth itself loses its worth in the opinion of those who receive it through the discredited channel. Custom-house oaths have become proverbially false, from the fact that they are habitually broken. The French government cannot obtain credit with the

people in any thing they publish, because they have so often given out the most direct and intentional falsehoods. It is a common expression to use to one who violates the truth, to say: "You lie like a bulletin." In many countries oaths of evidence are abused. This pernicious custom in France arose from the doctrine propagated in the times of religious persecution, and received by the people, that there was no sin in swearing falsely against a Huguenot. After they had practised this for a time, they found how convenient it was to lie against others.

License lying in one case, and many cases will be found in which it must be licensed. If the human race admits that it is right to lie, the whole human race will become a race of liars. What will you do under such circumstances? How can society proceed? You can trust no one; you can place no confidence in what you hear of the past, the present, or the future. You must become a perfect hermit. I think you will say that the world is undone. I think you will say that the few men whose lives might have been saved by telling falsehoods, might better have lost their lives, than have brought about such a state of things by sacrificing truth. I consider truth the basis of the divine kingdom. Without it, the world could not enjoy the benefits of the government of God.

In this college, and in some other places, a belief has arisen that persons ought not to make known the ill-conduct of their friends, when it will expose them to censure or to punishment. It is much to be regretted that such a doctrine should have obtained currency, as it is very erroneous, and may become very injurious.

A controversy about truth is a wicked one: whoever gives rise to it by opposing the truth is to blame. A man who wishes me to lie, is a greater enemy to me than a murderer. "There shall not enter in through the gates into the city," any thing that defileth, nor "whosoever loveth and maketh a lie." He who lies then, is, by the command of God himself, banished from the New-Jerusalem. If falsehood should reign in heaven it would make it a hell. Our whole race was destroyed by a lie. The fallen angels are now miserable because they have no confidence in each other. Satan is called the "Father of Lies."

When the question is viewed aright, of what importance and value does truth appear!

A lie is in no case whatever justifiable.

DISPUTE IX.

November 30, 1813.

Question. *Ought the Poor to be supported by law?*

Remark 1st. "Beside" is the preposition, and "besides" the adverb.

Remark 2d. "Reform" should never be used for "reformation."

Remark 3d. The Dutch had the best contrivance for the treatment of pauperism I have heard of. They took a man and set him to work, if he was able. If he would not work, they gave him several warnings. If these were ineffectual, they put him into a cistern and let in a sluice of water. It came in just so fast, that by briskly plying a pump, with which the cistern was furnished, he could keep himself from drowning. This is the best contrivance for the cure of laziness ever found; and if I were king I would establish it everywhere.

Remark 4th. Food, and the other necessaries of life have been very high for twenty years. Eggs used to be sold for four coppers a dozen, wood for two shillings a cord. Mr. Hillhouse's father told him, many years ago, that he would live to see wood sold for five shillings a cord, and it seemed at that time incredible. I asked Mr. Hillhouse what was the price of it then,

and he told me it was from two shillings to two shillings and sixpence.

Remark 5th. I have often been imposed upon by beggars; but I have made it a rule never to withhold charity when I cannot discover a cheat.

Remark 6th. Vagrancy cannot easily be suppressed. It has not been in any country that I know of except Holland.

DECISION.

The subject under discussion is one of the most difficult parts of human police. It is usual to allege, for not supporting the poor by law, the case of England. But because one system is bad, it is not certain that every other, devised for the same ends, must be so. Let the laws be executed, whatever they be, or you cannot judge of their tendency. It is much better to have indifferent laws well executed than good laws badly executed. In Scotland the poor do not have much support; or rather they have very little. The little they might have is diminished too, by stinting. How men of religion can sit by and see their brethren stinted, I cannot understand.

The poor must be supported: there is no question of this. We ought not to hesitate about giving to them in some way or other. We cannot consider ourselves as in the way of our duty while we refuse to assist them. A minister once preaching from the text: "He that giveth to the poor lendeth to the Lord," said, "My brethren, if you like your paymaster you will support those who need your aid."

The poor in Scotland are taught to read, write and

work. In England, until lately, there have been few schools. This has rendered the poor of that country idle and vicious. The want of education still prevails all over the continent of Europe in a great degree, and the same evil results are everywhere to be found. There is one great source of pauperism existing in both England and Scotland. In both those countries there are numerous manufactories, and of course many journeymen. These are a different class from any we have in the United States, each being taught but one branch or process in a business which embraces many, and of course unable to perform the whole, or to direct it. To whatever degree of perfection they may arrive in their own departments, they know nothing of those which are connected with them. They must necessarily ever continue to be journeymen, with no power or hope of rising. They are almost always profligate; they are ignorant; their employments are often unhealthy; and by these different causes operating together, they are rendered poor of course.

Another fact is to be noticed which increases the number of paupers in England. An enormous multitude of poor from the continent flock to London. In this country we have only one beggar to three or four hundred inhabitants: in England there is one to fourteen. By "beggar" here I mean one who is supported by others. In Hatfield, Massachusetts, are none; in Northampton four; and in Cornwall, Connecticut, there never was one.

In England, then, there is a vast deal to be done for the support of the poor; but it is evident that it is very badly done. The funds appropriated to that object are ill managed: for the parish officer gets as much as the

poor; and thus one half the taxes laid for their maintenance are diverted from their object. The abuses observed under this system, however, do not prove that the principle of supporting the poor at the public expense is either good or bad.

The plans which have been devised for the management of the poor in different countries are numerous and various. Count Rumford proposed in Bavaria to have a large building constructed, to accommodate a great number of persons comfortably; and when he had it finished according to his plan, the poor were invited by a proclamation to come and live in it. Of this invitation many accepted; but finding they had nothing to do, they soon became weary of it, and asked for employment. Having then a prospect of setting them at such work as might be useful, the experiment was thus far flattering: but meeting with opposition in the further prosecution of his plans, either from men in power, or from some other source, of which I am ignorant, he went to England, and the thing fell through.

A provision by law for the support of the poor, has not been carried through in any country except Holland. In this town there are about eighty paupers. They are treated well, but the system is very expensive. There are some difficulties in supporting the poor by law, under which we labor, and which it is difficult to overcome.

In the first place, the system must be cheap. In endeavoring to conform to this principle, in some places the poor are put up at auction, through a desire to secure their support at the cheapest possible rate, and the lowest bidder has them placed under his care.

In the second place, they are still to be kept comfortable.

In the third place, as much as possible must be done to make them labor. To train up children in idleness is worse for them than to cut off their heads.

I advise you to bestow as much thought on this subject as its importance demands. Take all the systems which have been proposed, analyze them and ascertain what is faulty and what is valuable in each. The support of the poor must, I think, be regulated by law, otherwise they will hardly be supported at all, and what they receive will often come from those who are least able to bestow in charity. If you are generous yourself, you must see persons sit by and not give a groat who are more able to give than yourself. The minds of many are very much like a cow's horn: large at one end, but with no opening at the other. They are willing to receive every thing, and keep it.

A man in Rhode-Island came home one cold and stormy evening, and, as he stood shivering before the fire exclaimed: "O what a cold night! how the poor must suffer! John do you go down cellar, get a bushel of coal, and carry it to such a poor widow—but bring the basket to me first." The servant went as he was ordered; but before he returned, his master called again: —"John," said he, "on the whole you need not go with the coals, the weather has grown so much more mild." This was when he had got warm.

Remember what Christ will say to those on his left hand: "I was an hungred and ye gave me no meat; I was thirsty and ye gave me no drink; I was a stranger and ye took me not in; naked, and ye clothed me

not; sick and in prison, and ye visited me not." If the poor are not sufficiently provided for in one way, they must be in another: and if the provision is insufficient, private exertions must be made to supply the deficiency. The Female Charitable Society in this town has done much good: more than men could have done. They have opportunities for doing good which men do not possess. They can go into families, ascertain the wants of the poor, and form well founded opinions of the claims of different individuals. They can ascertain characters, and discover who are worthy and who are not deserving of charity. With few means this society have done more good than men could have done with much greater. From the view I have taken of the poor, and the means for improving their condition, it is evident that the difficulties attending the subject are numerous and great. The man who shall form a good plan for their support, will be worthy of very high honor.

DISPUTE X.

December, 1813.

Question. *Would an extension of the Union be politic?*

DECISION.

If we are to extend our territory, we are to do it to increase either our happiness or our power. And as to the means, we are not going to force people to become republicans: they must act according to their own pleasure in deciding what government they will choose, and are not to be driven to any thing by us. We are to take care of ourselves: a duty we do not all recollect. I think the motto which was on our old "coppers" a very good one for us:—"Mind your business."

Would it increase our happiness or power to extend our territory? The Roman state was a very military one. They had much territory which was populous: yet it was not overthrown by revolts, but by foreign enemies. There was no interest felt on the part of the inhabitants to defend each other, because they were so far apart. Against this evil we should be on our guard. People in a great measure ignorant of each other, with no strong feeling of common interest, and separated by a wide distance, naturally have but little sympathy for each other; and the mere fact that they are under one government may not prove a sufficient bond of union. An attachment to the country is necessary among the inhabitants, and

that alone can produce great effects. The Hindoos, though effeminate, may become good soldiers. If they but possess the *amor patriæ*, they will fight well for their own land. Bonaparte has now under his control too much territory to derive advantage from this principle. He is weakening his power by taking distant countries. The people do not feel the "amor patriæ." But it is said, by some, that a republic will unite men, that it will draw them more closely together than other forms of government. But how is it in the United States? Are our countrymen strongly attached to those who dwell in distant states? are they much attached to the government of the United States? And if a disregard of the general government has already become extensive, what would it be after a greater extension of the Union? Mr. Jefferson said unwittingly, that it is better to have friends than enemies on our borders, without reflecting that though our borders should be more distant we should still have some other people beyond them. A farmer once said, he wished there was no outside row to his corn-field!

Small states, which are strong enough for self-defence, are happiest. Officers who are at a distance, so as not to be easily made accountable, are under temptations to abuse their power, and have often abused it. It is not so indeed in France at the present time: Bonaparte has his will done without regard to that of his subjects. Their interests or wishes are nothing to him: and it is by such measures as his that large empires are very apt to be unhappy ones. History is very instructive on these points.

From what I have said, it seems that large countries

are apt to be both weak and miserable, instead of being strong and happy. You must weaken power if you would possess privileges. The tendency of some plans, is to extend power; and I fear we may not stand long. I shall not see our fall, but you may.

DISPUTE XI.

December 7th, 1813.

Question. *Has Christianity been a temporal benefit?*

Remark. It is improper to render δαίμων devil: it signifies *evil spirit*, or *dæmon*. Of beings of this species we know nothing more than what the Scriptures teach us. We know that in ancient times persons were sometimes "possessed" by them.

DECISION.

The proof of this question is abundant, though men of authority have strenuously argued against it. We are to inquire, first, whether Christianity has benefited those who were Christians: and secondly, whether it has benefited the world at large.

First. Has it been a temporal benefit to those who were Christians? The mind of him who is a Christian looks into itself with pleasure: the unchristian man hates this employment. How great a difference must there necessarily be in the happiness of persons of these two characters! It is not to be expected that he who is not a Christian, and does not intend to become one, should voluntarily look into himself; but there are cases and circumstances which compel him to do it, at least occasionally, and in some degree. He who does

not practise it, and take pleasure in it, must be in a gloomy predicament. Without a disposition to observe one's own objects and motives, Heaven could not be happy. An aversion to this practice proves a consciousness that there is nothing in men that will bear our scrutiny, and nothing that we can approve. Looking into himself, to the unchristian man, is like looking into a dark room, filled with spectres and goblins. The goblins and spectres are crimes and wicked thoughts. How differently does it seem to the Christian! To him great promises are made, and by him they are realized. This makes the man happy. He looks forward to bright and glorious prospects:—but, remember, young gentlemen, "the sinner is without hope, and without God in the world." The follower of Christ is cheered by the promise: "When thou passest through the waters I am with thee, and through the floods they shall not overflow thee; when thou walkest through the fire thou shalt not be burnt, neither shall the flame kindle on thee." The fear of perdition comes upon every unchristian man: and this must embitter his life. Whence can he derive consolation, or a palliation of this fear? Let him look on his condition as he will, there is not a single hope that if he does not love God, God will bless him.

I knew a man who was always full of glee, and on the whole to all appearance, the most merry man I ever saw. I went to see him once and found him gloomy. I enquired the cause, and he said: "I have been alone, and have been obliged to look into myself; and cannot bear the sight."

The Christian loves his family, derives great enjoy-

ment from their society, and brings them up in sobriety. They are happy, and he is happy with them. Not only is his condition better at home, and his usefulness greater there, but he is happy in the neighborhood, and a blessing to it. The principle of peace and love which the Christian religion everywhere carries with it, is most directly calculated for the benefit of society, and those who practice it most faithfully do the most good, while they enjoy great tranquillity and pleasure. For an example immediately around us, I can mention an individual actuated by Christian principles in a single instance, to show their tendency to produce and maintain the peace and happiness of society. Deacon *******, of this town, was once abused by a man who had fallen into a passion with him. He bore all his violent expressions very calmly; and at length the angry man said, "I will do you all the harm I can." "And I," replied Deacon ******* "will do you all the good I can."

Christianity is obedience to the law of God. No one can believe that God would annex misery to what he has commanded and approved. The happiness of Heaven consists in righteousness, or obedience to God's law; and the blessedness of the Millennium will consist in the same.

In the *second* place, what has been the influence of Christianity upon the world?

We are told by some that it has occasioned wars; that it was the cause of numerous and bitter persecutions in the time of the Roman Emperors, and during the Reformation; and that it produced the crusades, and all the evils of which they were the occasion. Beside these, other evils have been charged upon Christianity:

but in reply I have it to say, that these dreadful things have been produced by one and a very different cause: —a thing common to us all—the evil disposition of man. And so far has Christianity been from producing wars, that it has strongly counteracted them. History will show, that wars have been much more frequent in unchristian than in Christian countries, and of a more ferocious and bloody character. The very principles of Christianity are directly opposed to those of war; which arise from a source against which Christianity stands in direct opposition. "Whence come wars and fightings among you? Come they not hence, even of your lusts?"

It is said that Christianity has been the cause of persecutions. But all nations have practised persecutions, where Christianity has not been known. Persecution then is found in men universally, and has nothing to do with the Christian religion. To this, also, it is diametrically opposed. Christ has taught us that we must forgive and pray for our enemies. I grant that Christians may persecute: but if they do, they have forgotten their Christianity. They often forget it in other cases, and may in this also.

But Christianity has clearly and essentially improved the condition of men in a great number of ways. It is but a short time since men almost universally thought, that the slave trade was justifiable. Many of those who entertained such a belief in this country, were among the best men I ever knew: but this belief was not a part of their goodness. The slave trade was carried on in Africa, among Pagans and Mohammedans, where there is no Christianity. It is folly to attribute to a cause effects which exist where the cause does not exist.

It may also be said of persecution, that it has been practised in different countries, and at different periods; and that, instead of being produced by Christianity, it has been most strongly opposed by it. The whole account of the origin of persecution is given in the story of Shadrach, Meshack and Abednego.

This is a short history of persecution—here it began. As to attributing to Christianity the persecutions practised by the church of Rome, it is as absurd as to attribute it to the Appian Way or the Tarpeian Rock. We are apt to be misled by names. What is called the Christian world, is much better called the christened world.

Christianity has put a stop to human sacrifices, mitigated the rigor of justice and animal tortures, put an end to gladiatorial shows, and to contests between men and wild beasts, (except in Spain,) beside other evils of an important and general nature, all of which it would be difficult to name. Among its positive benefits, it has raised women to their proper rank in society, provided for the education of children, taken hold on the poor, and done much towards making them happy. It must also have given kings and nobles different feelings towards their inferiors. Such is the natural effect of the doctrines of Christianity. When a prince enters the house of God, he must feel humbled to think that among the poor around him, are better men than himself. Christianity has, to a great extent, changed the face of the world. It has founded hospitals, established laws, supplied innocent entertainments in the place of such as are mischievous, rendered travelling safe, created a regard for personal worth, advanced science

and taste, formed the laws of nations, by which war has lost half its horrors, by which the persons of foreigners are protected in distant countries, and prisoners are treated with humanity and kindness. Captives are no longer thrown from the Tarpeian Rock. The dreadful kind of slavery which awaited those who were made prisoners in battle has ceased. Beside these benefits, provision is made for the discovery of unknown regions, and to bring to light people unknown. Blessings are transported from one country to another.

Christianity promotes civilization. It is the means of improving and extending it, as I have intended to show in my preceding remarks. Its direct tendency is to promote it, of which I will give a practical proof in a plain matter of fact. Mr. David Brainard took up his abode among about one hundred uninstructed Indians, who formed a tribe, or part of a tribe, in a region at that time a wilderness. His exertions were blessed in a remarkable degree, so that he admitted to the privileges of members of the church seventy-five of that number. What was the effect? Their character was changed. The next year they purchased land, built a church, and founded a school. Before he visited them they were the lowest of savages, and sunk in poverty, ignorance, and wretchedness.

Christianity has so powerful an effect upon savages, that if the Indians of this country are ever to be civilized, they must first be Chrisianized.

DISPUTE XII.

Question. *Ought the Clergy to be supported by law?*

Remark 1st. It is often said that if the clergy are not supported by law, only such men as devote themselves to the labors of a minister from a sense of duty will engage in them. There are those in society who embrace the doctrine that the only standard to which it is proper to bring the qualifications of a minister of the gospel is, that of his becoming such from a belief that it is his duty. But if this be admitted, it will plainly be out of your power to exclude any from the desk who profess to feel such a conviction. They alone can know whether they have it, except so far as they betray a different spirit to others. They are expected to decide the matter themselves, and to them it is desired by some to leave it. Of course they would implicitly take the word of any one who might declare that he considered himself called on by duty to preach. Such a person might be asked why he thought it his duty; and might reply that he was convinced he might in that manner do good: but perhaps in the opinion of every judicious man who knew him, he might appear to have greatly mistaken his prospects. Many such men are evidently not fit to preach, and their conduct proves it. Any one who is indolent or improvident, or negligent of the support of his family is declared to be unfit: "He that provideth not for his own, specially for those of his own

house, hath denied the faith, and is worse than an infidel!"

But this declaration includes also those who engage in preaching the gospel without any prospect of supporting their families: and no one would willingly have this passage of Scripture apply to himself. He could not then, in conscience, become a clergyman, if he were married or expected to be, unless there were some means offered him for the support of his family.

But it may be said that the clergy may live unmarried; this has been abundantly tried. The clergy of the Romish church have lived unmarried; but to what dreadful immorality has this practice led! Cases have been known, and those in great numbers, in which enormous vices have sprung from this source, debasing and injurious to society in an incalculable degree.

Where then will you get your ministers, if you do not support them by law? I will tell you where. You will get them from among the pettifoggers of religion: the separatical preachers: those who pretend to differ from every body, and know little or nothing of what they talk about. Such men bring disgrace upon religion, and do little good to those who place confidence in them. They keep their hearers off at arm's length, and will not let them know what their religion is. Ministers must be men who deserve respect for their lives and for their intelligence: otherwise they do much evil in society. In a neighboring State, to refer to one example, a particular sect are fast becoming infidels: and why? Because their ministers are so ignorant, and are worthy of so little esteem, that they bring dishonor upon religion.

Remark 2d. It is said that it is not difficult to obtain subscriptions in large towns, and that the people if left to themselves, will furnish clergymen sufficient means of support. But it is to be recollected that there are few large towns, and ministers who live in small towns must be supported also. Where the people are scattered, some will find it inconvenient to attend public worship as regularly as others, and will feel, if left to their own choice, as if they might be excused from contributing as much as others for the payment of the minister. Difficulties would thus arise in supporting the minister, which could not be easily removed, unless some other system were adopted.

Remark 3d. Ministers should be good men: for the people will never be better than the standard held up to them, either in their conduct or in their doctrines.

Remark 4th. There is a vast difference between members of English churches in England. One class of them believe all the doctrines of Calvinists except two: the doctrines of decrees and the perseverance of saints; the other believe religion to consist in being baptised and receiving the sacrament, and leading what is called a moral life: avoiding gross sins, like profaneness, intemperance, &c. One great evil in the Church of England is, that the livings are presented by the king, the bishops, the land holders and others, not the people themselves. The land holders are often fox hunters; and they make such ministers their clergymen as will hunt with them. Another evil is, that children are picked out by their parents, and destined to the ministry from their childhood. This of course

is done without any knowledge of what characters they may possess in mature life, and the practice brings many unfit men into the desk. A gentleman who has several sons, in England, determines what professions they are to follow, while they are yet boys. One he destines to the army, another to the navy, a third to the bar and a fourth to the church. No ordinary change of character from better to worse will divert the parent from his purpose; and unless something extraordinary occurs, they pursue the professions to which he has devoted them, and regard one as much a mere source of support as another. When a young man has obtained a living, as it is called, he often procures a curate to perform the duties to which he is professedly devoted, and spends his time where he pleases, at a distance. The number of non-resident clergymen in England increased in two years two hundred. I would not reduce the incomes of the Bishops too much, for they should be "given to hospitality," which they cannot be, unless they have something to be hospitable with. They should be rich enough to be able to reprove the rich, and not so rich as to be inaccessible to the poor.

Remark 5th. Those who profess law and physic have their fees secured to them: why should not clergymen?

Remark 6th. How can the clergy get books, if they are not sufficiently paid? It is much complained of by some persons in this country, that clergymen get so few books. It is hard to muzzle the mouth of the ox, and then complain that he will not tread out the corn.

Remark 7th. I took up the practice of expounding

the Scriptures when I was minister of a parish. I never was thanked so much for any other sermons as for those. For this reason I think it is necessary to explain the plainer truths of the Scripture, as well as the more intricate.

Remark 8th. In Rhode-Island, where the clergy are not supported by law, there are very few towns supplied with ministers.

DECISION, MARCH 9th.

"Ecclesiastical establishment" is a term that does not apply to religion as it is supported in Connecticut. More properly speaking, we should call the system for its support the Legal Establishment of the Worship of God. All classes of Christians, are here invested with the same privileges: can hold property, form contracts, act as parties at law, &c. So far as is consistent, they are left to their own choice of the mode and manner of worship; but they are required to contribute to the support of some public worship or other. The first inhabitants of the state having been all congregationalists, the law requires others to pay for the support of ministers of that denomination unless they signify a wish to have their tax applied to the support of some other.* There are two parties who consider the system of Connecticut wrong: those who think it unlawful, and those who think it inexpedient.

First, with regard to its reasonableness or justice. The legislature of every state in the Union is the superintendant of its prudential concerns. Morality is

* The present constitution of that State has changed this feature in the laws.

indispensable to the prosperity of every community; and as morality is merely a branch of religion, it is plain that the support of religion is a duty on this ground. From the intimate and inseparable connection between morality and religion, arises a most manifest necessity of religion to a nation. No free government has ever existed without religion. But one attempt was ever made to establish such a government without it: that was made in France. Instead of that government becoming the equitable, mild and free one it was by its advocates expected to be, it was worse than an irruption of Goths and Vandals.

One great and important duty of a government is, to punish crimes: but it is wiser, and more humane to prevent crimes than to punish them. Of how much value then is morality, and the institutions by which it is encouraged and extended: for in it is the great preventive of crimes of all sorts; and the foundation of morality, we must ever remember—is religion. On the ground of public happiness and public security then, even those who do not wish to avail themselves personally of the direct benefits of religion, might as well plead an exemption from contributing for the support of roads, bridges, and other constructions of indispensable necessity, because they do not use them, as to excuse themselves from the support of the public preaching of the Gospel.

Some objectors say, that the influence of religion should be brought into operation independently of every thing else, and that the declaration of the Saviour: "My kingdom is not of this world," is opposed to the principle of affording to religion any support by the laws of the State. But that declaration had no

reference to any question of this kind. He said also that the gates of hell shall never prevail against his church. Was this a promise of a miraculous support of his ministers? We are not to expect that God will produce by miracles what men ought to do and can do: of course we are to presume that this object is to be accomplished by human exertions, and by means calculated to the end.

DISPUTE XIII.

December 14th, 1813.

Question. *Ought Anonymous Publications to be suppressed?*

DECISION.

THE evils to be remedied are first to be considered. If we find there are no real evils arising from the publication of anonymous publications, there will of course be no necessity for a remedy.

As to the remedies which we have now in our reach, against evils which may be expected to arise,—the printer is responsible for what he publishes. But perhaps the writer will risk the money necessary to indemnify the printer for what he may suffer in case of prosecution, and persuade him to keep his name secret. The writer, as some think, ought always to be known, that he might suffer the punishment of popular odium, if the works deserved reprehension. But the evil of injurious publications is in part guarded against by the injury which recoils upon the publisher. Knowing himself to be exposed to forfeit his right to print, as he should be by law, he would probably be careful not to print what would give offence. But it is better to require the writer to make himself known. What harm would he suffer from it? If he wrote against a corrupt government, he could not lose much, though he might

expose himself to their persecution—nay, he would gain: for, if the government should punish him, the people would love him. If the security were to be sought by laying restrictions upon the printer, the fines laid for offensive publications should be large. I think the truth ought not always to be spoken about a government: for there are cases in which injury might arise from it, and no good. Truth, when necessary, ought to be published. In desperate cases it should be made public at all events: but we are not disputing about desperate cases.

No law entirely prevents the crimes which it intends to prevent. A man who wishes to slander another, would not commonly do it if he were obliged to accompany the slander with his own name. I saw a foul slander against General Washington soon after the war; but I do not believe the author of it would have had his name known for all the money in the country.

Some years ago a man came over from Bristol, in England, and settled in New-York, where he began to write anonymously for the newspapers. He called himself a "Revolutionary Patriot," and was not suspected. One night a thief broke into his house, and threw his desk out of the window into the yard, where it lay until discovered the next spring by the servant of a neighbor's family. Its contents showed that the blustering "Revolutionary Patriot," who had had so much to say in the papers, was a Bristol shoemaker, who had left home after the close of the war. We may be sure that had the law required authors to subscribe their names to their writings, he would not have written as he did.

If writers were compelled to make themselves known, a man without character would have no influence by the

bad things he wrote, and a man of good character would not incur the risk of losing it. But it would be difficult to exert as powerful a control upon bad writings through the printer. He would not feel as if his character were injured by a penalty aimed at the writings of another. The writer must be come at.

There is an unwillingness with many persons to appear before the public as acknowledged authors. But custom changes many things, and would change this. A young man would not feel ashamed to publish his productions, if custom and law sanctioned the publishment of works with the authors' names. There is a great taste in this country for bad publications: I hope it may be changed. I believe that such a law as we have been considering, would make publications better, though fewer.

Such a law, I believe, would be a public blessing.

DISPUTE XIV.

Question. *Would a division of the Union be beneficial?*

Remark 1st. As to the right of search, I do not think the evil lies with us altogether. Our government however has not taken a single step to alter it during the last session of Congress. The evil is partly this: we are so much like the English that they cannot discriminate, in many cases, between their countrymen and ours. An honest man who has been born in the United States, will say so; and a dishonest man who was not born here, will say the same. Now, for the remedy of this, protections are given by public authority. But of what value can protections be when it is a matter of notoriety that they are bought at a fixed price? I have it from a merchant of this town, that one of these certificates was given not long since in New-York to a foreigner of a very marked appearance and dialect, which it was impossible to mistake. The officer, perceiving that it would be in vain to attempt to pass for an American, gave him a Portuguese protection. This the merchant stated on his own authority: having been present when the protection was applied for and granted. It is natural, while the principle on which this species of evidence professes to be founded is thus disregarded, that no faith should be placed in protections, and that other evidence should be sought for. There

has been a great deal of falsehood practised in this country in relation to persons claimed as citizens. As an example, a subject of Great Britain, after a residence in the United States, returned home, was recognized, and executed as a deserter, confessing the truth of the charge. A great noise was made in this country, because it was declared that he was an American, and born in Danbury in this State. Inquiry was made to ascertain the truth, and one of the select men of that town affirmed, after a particular examination, that the man had never been there in his life.

Remark 2d. I take it we shall have an embargo next: for commonly before an embargo, we have a parcel of speculators from the south travelling to Boston, Salem, and other eastern ports; and I believe this is the case now.

Remark 3d. Massachusetts for some time paid more to the government, than all the other states put together, and still made no noise about it.

Remark 4th. You enquire, "How shall we defend ourselves if attacked by a foreign power?" We have got the *gun boats!*

Remark 5th. Very erroneous ideas are entertained about the produce of land. When I was in Standish, in the district of Maine,* in 'ninety-seven, the people told me that it was but twelve years since they first learned that they could cultivate land. When I was there they had a farming town. The district has much neglected land already inhabited, which might be rendered productive, by manuring it with sea-weed and fish, of which

* The changes which have taken place in Maine since these remarks were made have been very great.

they have an abundance. At the beginning of the revolutionary war, the English promised the inhabitants that they would not injure them, if they would refrain from hostilities: but they fitted out privateers at Portland, to cruize against their vessels, neglecting their soil; and the crops being that year worse than ever in this country, they felt the effects of it more than they would ordinarily have done, and suffered much distress. Having been accustomed to a different manner of life from that of agriculture, it was difficult for the inhabitants of that part of the country to turn their attention to it. They might feed themselves with the products of their own land, if they did not depend on lumber and fish for their support, and neglect their soil.

In this state we should starve, if we were not an agricultural people. We now suffer much from the quantity of grain consumed by the distilleries; but I do not know how we could stop them from working. The crops produced in Massachusetts the last season, are sufficient to support the inhabitants of that state thirty months. All the northern states have it in their power to victual themselves, and much more.

Remark 6th. There is very little equity in the political discussions of this country.

Remark 7th. I think it is time for the old "Tree of Liberty" to die: we have heard enough about it. The French used to make a display of the "Bonnet Rouge," carrying it about on public occasions. I think that if the old lady, Liberty, had paid the French a visit when they talked so much about her, the first thing she would have done would have been, to go to the milliner's and get herself a new bonnet.

Remark 8th. The Legislature of Massachusetts, by an enquiry which they directed to be made, found that there were but about twenty seamen from that state, on board the British fleet. How far is this from being reconcilable with the exaggerated reports which are reiterated on this subject by the newspapers! Assertions are often made on the subject without foundation. A man, whose character I very well knew, declared that there were twenty natives of Northampton in English ships of war. The truth is, that the person who enrolled the names of those who were reported to be detained as seamen by the British, received a certain liberal sum for every name he obtained.

It is strange that the states of the south should express so much interest just now for the welfare of our seamen, and care more about them than we do at the north, whence all our seamen go. The subject of impressed seamen, as a ground of quarrel with Great Britain, was kept up when all other pretensions failed. The truth is, this was not the cause of the war: it is only a false label put upon it.

Remark 9th. The capital stock of a community is but very small. It lies in fact in the labor of the people. I should think that, in five or six years, the business of New-England would equal its stock. This is not the light in which people commonly view the subject: if it were, they would see the necessity of encouraging labor. Two hundred and fifty people in one town in New-England, who have been thrown out of employment by the war, are supported by the town. If they were furnished with business, they might contribute to the public benefit by their labor: but they feel no in-

terest in seeking it, because that would prevent them from being supported by the town.

Remark 10th. Farmers will not work any where but on a farm: put one into a school and he will die.

Remark 11th. The cause assigned for taxing the slaves in this country, never existed, and never will exist.

Remark 12th. It cannot be said that we are oppressed by the Southern States: Congress do what is done.

Remark 13th. The people of the Southern States suppose their interests to be different from ours. It has been thought, (Mr. Jefferson made the remark,) that it is necessary for us to relinquish commerce. Mr. Madison also made such a declaration, in a speech which it was believed Mr. Jefferson had cooked and seasoned according to his own taste. But there is nothing incompatible in the commerce of the East and the agriculture of the South. The truth is, we have the same interests as the southern States, but they do not think so. It is for their benefit that we should take their commodities from their hands, and have them manufactured. A New-Englander loves water as well as a duck; but the habits and feelings of the southern man are different. He chooses to remain on shore. But the produce of the south is of little value if confined there: it must be taken to a distant market or manufactory, and the New-Englander is ready to transport it, and to bring something more valuable in return.

DECISION.

In my view, there is no difference between the interests of the northern, middle, and southern States. They think their interests are different: but the variety of climate and the excellence of soil southward, afford many and abundant products; and the inhabitants of the east, who possess not these advantages, have ships and skill in navigation, and are prepared to carry them to other countries as well as to different parts of our own land. It would be beneficial to both parties to proceed on this system without embarrassment. One is interested in having its products transported to manufactories and markets, and the other in being the carrier; and both divisions should feel that their interests are united.

But as it is at the present time, the southern States clash with the northern and western; and the question is, whether a division should be made in the country, that each portion may pursue its own course. If a division were once effected, difficulties of a more serious nature might arise than any we have yet seen between different parts. The northern States would have it in their power to stop the mouth of the Mississippi; but if the southern or western States should make war upon us, they would not be able to carry it on alone, but must obtain assistance from foreign powers. If they should derive any benefit from this, foreigners would acquire an influence among them: and foreign manners and foreign feelings would be mingled with their own.

The apprehension of a divided interest has arisen

in Congress. It is unhappy that a part of our countrymen have imbibed the sentiments of the French, and joined with them: for they who are divided in one thing, are apt to be divided in every thing. I have seen this fact very strongly proved in a certain class in this college. There were five or six parties in it; and the members came together only to dispute.

Our government have taken a course that is calculated to excite a spirit of division.

In the first place, the national government have taken all possible measures to annihilate commerce. These measures have been severely felt by one part of the country. The New-England people are fitted by Providence for commerce, with an extensive sea coast, numerous harbors, timber for ship-building, and habits of labor and perseverance. They have long been engaged in it, and are to a great extent dependent upon it. They may bear the deprivation of it for a time, but they will not be willing to submit to it always. There are no people in the world more disposed to submit to government, and more unwilling to disobey it: but oppression makes a wise man mad. The commerce of the north is to be destroyed because Mr. Jefferson has declared, that it is better for the United States to have none! It was a strange thing for one man to say, when there were a great many men far wiser than he to whom he thus pretended to dictate. What good reason has Mr. Jefferson for his opposition to commerce? Is it not profitable? It is too profitable: there is the secret. But whence did he or Congress derive the authority to say whether we should have commerce or not? We live by commerce, as much as the people of the south and

west live by agriculture. Has Mr. Jefferson or Congress the power to prohibit the cultivation of their land? What would they say if such power should be claimed and exercised?

In the second place, you will observe the manner in which the representatives from the west and the south talk of this part of the Union will not soon be forgotten. They talk of "shortening us by the head," of making us "more submissive." Thunder and Lightning Williams, as he is called, and others who possess a spirit similar to his own, have used insulting expressions like these in Congress, when speaking of the eastern States; but you do not find such expressions used by us in regard to the inhabitants of other parts of the Union. It has been supposed by some, that young men coming to this college from the south, would be exposed to such epithets among us, presuming that they would be looked upon with evil eyes. This is a great mistake: we have no political parties here. Let a student exert himself to make proficiency, and perform his various duties well, and that is enough. We ask, what kind of a scholar is he? Not, to what party does he belong? Our true interest, which we should all understand, is to diffuse useful knowledge, and to promote sound and harmonious sentiments. It is only by pursuing a course in opposition to this, and at variance with good sense, that we shall incur any danger of division.

By fostering jealousies, creating local feelings in opposition to each other, and indulging in violent denunciations, the union of the states may perhaps be dissolved: but it will not be suddenly effected. It will be the result of deliberation. Our New-Englanders are delibe-

rate in determining, but when they once begin to act, they are resolute. If they ever divide the union, it will be because they are forced to do it; and they will not leave their work unfinished.

But the evils of disunion would be so great, that nothing like an advantage which appears to be promised by it, is worthy of a moment's regard. Such arguments, as are commonly advanced by those who advocate it ought not to be thought of for a moment. They are of little importance when the whole subject is viewed in its proper light. Dissolution would involve so many calamities, that it would be childish to weigh it against a few questions of local interest, which are as nothing when put in contrast with it. In the midst of great national sufferings, who would think of a local question confined to pecuniary interests? As a plain man once said: "There is no splitting hairs in a whirlwind."

And those who are now promoting feelings of disunion have the most to fear from separation. The same prosperity, security and solidity are not to be looked for at the south as at the north. The circumstances and habits of the people are different, and those who know them should realize the fact. A division of the Union was agitated soon after the constitution was formed, and the question was frequently and fully discussed. A gentleman in Philadelphia, in conversing on the subject with a friend, told him that Pennsylvania, in case of a division, would be on the side with New-England: if not, he desired that his sons might change their abode to the Eastern states.

But whatever may be our reasoning, our country, it

is to be feared, may fall. As to the place of division, probably the Atlantic states will divide first.

There are many indications unfavorable to its long continuing in union and prosperity. The scheme of buying votes for the President has been introduced, and is put in practice among us, by those who hope to obtain offices as their reward. Fraud of all kinds grows out of such a system, as naturally as a vegetable from a stem. And it grows every year, and is extending and diffusing itself in every direction. How lamentable it is that dishonesty and degradation should so rapidly seize upon this country! Our corruption is premature: it is the plague infixed at the age of ten.

DISPUTE XV.

Question. *Have the Crusades been beneficial?*

Remark 1st. You will find that ambition has produced more wars, and far more bloody ones, than superstition.

Remark 2d. It is generally believed, that Europe lost three millions of men in the Crusades. I do not believe she could possibly have raised, clothed, and armed so many. Bonaparte has all the power the nations engaged in the Crusades had; and yet last year he could raise only half a million. Gibbon tells us this story about three millions; but he is entitled to no credit. Out of sixty-five quotations he made which have been examined into, it is proved that fifty were false. It is very easy at any time to write down a large number of any thing, and it fills the mouth full: but the question is about the truth. I do not see how such an army as Gibbon speaks of, could have lived three years. They would require an immense multitude of laborers to feed them, and they had nothing to sail in but the barks of the Genoese, which were not bigger than our sloops, and could transport but a few.

Remark 3d. Mohammedism is no more Christian-

ity, than any thing else. It is neither fish, flesh nor fowl.

DECISION.

Whether the Crusades have been beneficial or not, has been decided differently by different writers. Gibbon thinks they were undoubtedly hurtful to the human race. Chateaubriand thinks they were glorious enterprises.

Europe was under the Feudal System before the wars of the Crusades commenced, and the people, at the will of their lords, were called into the field at any moment to fight any enemy he might choose to attack. Wars were very frequent, and the causes of immense evils. As they commonly have taken place in those seasons of the year when the weather was mild, and subsistence easily obtained, the labors of the field have been often interrupted, and agriculture has suffered severely. This was particularly the case in the times of the Crusades, when the injury they caused to the countries which engaged in them, were in this respect of a most serious nature. They tended also to extend the power of the Roman Pontiff, which had long been established, but was subject to continual fluctuations. He had received from St. Peter the keys of heaven, and being able to let in and shut out whomsoever he pleased, had great sway so far as his claims were acknowledged. Whenever a spirited prince arose, however, the Pontiff found his power checked, his influence over men's minds being lessened. At the beginning of the twelfth century, his power was as complete as possible; and it was when Peter the Hermit began to go about Europe, preaching the duty of

recovering the Holy Sepulchre, that the project of a Crusade was favored as a scheme proper for all Christendom to engage in. Multitudes left their homes, and multitudes perished. Their numbers have ever been magnified.

Neither enthusiasm nor superstition was the cause of the Crusades. The Turks, who embarked against the Christians, were possessed at that time of great power, and threatened Europe. It was better to attack them than to be attacked by them; and no doubt acting against the Saracens was the best policy that could be adopted at that time, under the circumstances which existed. I see nothing wrong in the Europeans then embarking against the Saracens in their own defence; though I believe better means might be devised in these days for accomplishing the purpose.

The people were extensively influenced by superstition, but not by religion. They fought for the recovery of the Sepulchre of Christ, which was no better than any other tomb, and the church built over it, which is no better than any other church. Superstition can hardly be said to have on the coat of religion. The motive of the Crusaders was a foolish one: but it seems to me that they gave Europe an impulse which it could not have otherwise received. The Crusades soon greatly impaired the Feudal System. Poland and Bohemia embarked but little if at all in the crusades, and they have kept that system to this day: the worst that could be contrived. Our very language bears evidence of its debasing influences: vassals were formerly called knaves and villains—words then no more opprobrious than such as 'honest, skilful,' but now used

to signify the worst of men. We are apt to look upon despotism as the worst of all Governments: but, in the Feudal System we have little men whose minds were little things, and employed about little things. Such rulers are far worse than great monarchs, though they be despotic. This system was an axe laid at the root of all human reformation.

It is a question, often asked: did the Crusades destroy the Feudal System? at that period the noblemen were expensive in their habits, and in those wars vied with each other in the splendor of their preparations. The limited means at their command were speedily straitened, by the rapid waste of resources and the impoverishment of the country. Their only resort often was to borrow what they could not seize upon as their own; and in return they in many instances granted privileges, particularly freedom to their vassals. Here was the beginning made which led to the destruction of the Feudal System; and important benefits soon began to proceed from the change. The system discouraged labor to a very great extent, by giving the fruits of labor to the land-holder. Men will not labor unless the products of it be secured to them; but when they enjoy even an imperfect control over them, they are encouraged to exert themselves to render the soil productive. The lords, dukes and nobility of all classes were generally rapacious and oppressive. They exacted what they could of the products of agriculture, and kept the cultivators in poverty and debasement. But when they returned from the Holy Land, they often found themselves humbled in their turn. They were frequently unable to pay their prince their dues. and their land

escheated to him. Numbers of them never returned from the Crusades. One nobleman would die without an heir; another would leave only a daughter. The prince would seize the estate of the former, and perhaps marry the daughter of the latter to secure her inheritance. The people sometimes found such a change of masters advantageous to themselves: for a great tyrant is not so bad as a little one.

The Crusades had a favorable influence on taste. Those who engaged in them had opportunities to see the remains of Grecian architecture, and carried home with them the feelings which they produce. The Crusaders are generally supposed to have brought to Europe what is called the Gothic style. They brought home also some of the useful arts, improved agriculture, &c. They introduced some of the Saracens, who taught the sciences, and laid the foundation of considerable improvements in Europe.

The milder features which war assumed about that period, have since prevailed; and contests between nations have been far less bloody ever since. Comparatively very few prisoners have since been murdered in cold blood.

The Crusades then gave a great impulse to Europe. They roused the energy of man, and its operation has produced great effects. I do not believe the Reformation would ever have taken place but for the Crusades, for before the changes which they caused, nothing could have been found to work upon. I will leave it to you to determine whether the good or evil effects are greatest.

DISPUTE XVI.

Question. *Ought Religious Tests to be required of civil officers?*

Remark 1st. I have no hesitation in calling in question the decisions of great men. I would call in question any opinion, for the sake of finding the truth.

Remark 2d. There are some defects in our Constitution—great ones: but I believe it is the best we can get under existing circumstances. The framers of it always thought it imperfect; and since its formation, one of its most important parts has been destroyed: the independence of the judiciary. If Mr. Jefferson had done but this only, he would deserve disapprobation to the end of time. It is highly discreditable to us that we do not acknowlege God in our Constitution. Now it is remarkable that the grossest nations and individuals, in their public acts, and in their declarations, manifestoes, proclamations, &c. always recognize the superintendency of a supreme being. Even Napoleon does it. We, however, have neglected to do it. God says: "They who despise me shall be lightly esteemed;" and we have rendered ourselves liable, as a nation, to his displeasure. The corruption which is now rapidly extending in this country, gives reason for apprehension that we are soon to suffer the punishment to which

we have exposed ourselves. We do not regard it: we can boast as well as any people, and have full confidence in our power, independently of the supreme director of the affairs of men. Of this there is evidence in some of our public papers.

In a late proclamation fast the preamble says: "Whereas, we are engaged in a just war, and rely on the prowess of our armies, and being willing to remember God, &c."

Remark 3d. Different writers have considered the original formation of government in two very different points of view: 1st, as appointed by God; and 2d, as formed by men, who agreed among themselves to surrender part of their rights to preserve the remainder. If we suppose the former to have been the true origin of government, and pursue the course consistent with it, we shall determine to have "just men" for rulers, "ruling in the fear of God." An infidel does not come in here: this principle would exclude all who have not the fear of God before their eyes. When however you proceed on the supposition, that the establishment of government is the mere spontaneous work of men, assembling in a convention to determine what is expedient for themselves, and talking about their natural rights, some persons will be found, who will claim the right to rule. This right has been seriously treated by some, a great deal more so than it deserves. If there be such a thing as a natural right to rule, it cannot have been created by any circumstances of society; but must exist in all cases. But it is absurd to suppose that it can exist in solitude: in that state of separation from each other, assumed by the advocates of the doctrine of the human

institution of government, to have been the original state of man. I conceive that there is no such thing in any man as a right to office: it is a mere gift, and the object of it is not the benefit of the individual, but the good of the public. It is curious to observe those men who are so anxious to secure all their rights. In all our discussions of politics, in all we hear about claims which men have on their country, there are many rights, but no duties. We live on that side of the river where all the rights lie.

Remark 4th. If men think their offices will clear them from moral obligation, let them remember a lawyer, who, in the course of a plea, stated several things as law, which were very far from being so. When he had closed, a friend inquired with surprise how he could say what he knew was totally false. "O," replied he, "I did it as a lawyer." "My friend," returned the other, "when the Devil comes for the lawyer, what will become of the man?"

DECISION.

I am of opinion, young gentlemen, that a religious test would not, on the whole, be beneficial. I do not believe that if a law establishing one should be passed, it would exclude infidels from office. The only advantages to be expected from such a law would be these: the public would be impressed with the importance of choosing men who are not infidels; and such infidels as might obtain offices would keep their principles to themselves. In England infidels in office always show an external respect towards religion, in their public business. In our congress, however, they some-

times set religion at nought. When a vote was taken for a chaplain a short time since, there were three votes given for Mathew Lyon and one for Tom Paine.

That a law establishing a religious test should exclude infidels from office cannot be. Infidels are composed of Deists or Atheists, Unbelievers, (or those who believe nothing about religion,) Animalists, Materialists, Sceptics, (not much differing from unbelievers,) and Partial Atheists, (they who deny the immortality of the soul.) The unbeliever may be called a Nihilist. Now in which of these classes will you find a man who will stagger at an oath? Theists are most likely to do so: but they overthrow all natural religion, and say that crimes are to be avoided only for fear of the whip, the pillory or the gallows.

It may be said that talents are necessary in governors, and that the talents of infidels may be needed by the state. There are men of talents among infidels, but not half so many as among Christians. There are always men of talent known in every Christian country. It may also be said, that an infidel may be found who would respect his character so much as to act with care, and not offend those who might place confidence in him. But if there were such an one, he would be "rara avis." You might find one: but you would have to hunt a long time for a second.

One bad magistrate makes a great many bad men. This truth is most abundantly and powerfully exhibited in the Scriptures. There we find the people led into crimes and depredation by bad rulers, and suffering severe punishment for them, until they repented. Such nations as continued in their iniquity, God in his dis-

pensations always destroys. He let the Amorites alone until their iniquity was full, and then their punishment followed. Bad men will produce an influence by their example and their exertions: they will mislead and corrupt the people, and thus expose them to public calamities. Bad rulers are more hurtful to a nation, than any other men in it; and every man who votes should give this subject serious consideration, and ask himself whether he is prepared to choose a man for his ruler who will bring the country to ruin.

There are a multitude of infidels in office in this country, and they draw "iniquity with a cart rope." They do not appear as the champions of their principles! they do not defend them, for they know they are not worth a groat. Christians do not attack them, though it is their duty to do so. Their doctrines should be proclaimed, assailed and refuted. Good men should carry the sword into the camp of the enemy; they would have found only a hovel to fight against instead of a fortress; and their foes, like Tartars, who will run, and only shoot flying. There were never more despicable arguments used than those used by infidels to prove their points. Among other things to be remarked of them is this: that they suppose extreme cases to prove what should or should not be done. Nothing can be more miserable than to be driven to this course in defending one's ground.

Extreme cases are sometimes supposed, from which to draw something favorable by them; and I will suppose that a country, in danger from its enemies, possesses but one man who understands military tactics: what shall be done? I should think such a man point-

ed out by the finger of God to lead the armies, and should hope that his regard to reputation, the safety of his own family, his friends and himself, would make him discharge his office well.

I think a test law would not keep infidels from office, and therefore would do no good.

DISPUTE XVII.

December 28th, 1813.

Question. *Are all mankind descended from one pair?*

Remark 1st. Those who were engaged in building the Tower of Babel were the Cushites. After the confusion of tongues, the children of Shem fell upon them, and drove them away. They then went into Egypt, and conquered the inhabitants. They were probably the builders of the pyramids, and may have sent colonies into Spain and France. They had the only scheme of theology which existed in those days of antiquity, and diffused it wherever they went. We find the remains of it to this day. The other descendants of Noah, spread in other directions, and among various nations we find traditions of one common origin. The Mexicans represented that they were separated from other people after the confusion of tongues. They have a distinct account of the Deluge, and have preserved the name of the man who led them over to America. The relations between different languages also often indicate a common source. The Hindoos have some words which are identical with some in the Hebrew language.

Remark 2d. Lord Kaimes says, that such women in Ethiopia as never expose their faces to the sun, are

white. On such ground as this, I would not build any theory. It is as good proof, in a general point of view, as a man once obtained of the value of feather beds by his first experiment. Having never slept upon one, but having declared that he believed them to be hard, he put a single feather upon a rock and lay upon it all night. In the morning he said: "That is the hardest bed I ever slept upon."

Remark 3d. The builders of the old fortifications in this country, I suspect did not come from Asia. Those who crossed to this continent from Asia were a roving people for a long time after their arrival; and those whose origin has been traced thither represent this to have been the fact with regard to themselves. All the Indians on this continent probably could not build one of these fortifications, if they were disposed. But when we recollect that it has never been their practice to work, the difficulty is still further increased. They had nothing to dig with except small wooden spades and stone hoes; and nothing in which they could have removed the earth from one spot to another but baskets and deer skins. In some of those fortifications are what are called in Europe barrows: that is tall mounds containing the remains of the dead; and these so closely resemble those found in some parts of Russia, that it seems as if they must have been formed by the same hands. Some of these heaps in the western States are thirty feet high; and, as they have a broad base, contain a large quantity of earth. Now to imagine our Indians engaged in heaping up such masses, is to fancy them in an employment entirely foreign to their habits. Indeed, the builders of these works could not have vic-

tualled themselves if they had been in the condition of Indians.

I have no doubt that this continent was visited by Europeans before it was discovered by Columbus. The builders of these fortifications understood mathematics; they had been accustomed to the erection of watch-towers, the enclosing of wall within wall, the construction of covered ways, parapets, brick wells, &c. &c. At the Blue Licks iron utensils have been found thirty feet deep in the earth. In different parts of the western country, it is said that one hundred and twenty one skeletons have been found, buried in eleven squadrons of eleven men each. Lying by them were found iron knives and looking glasses. Over them were said to be growing trees two or three hundred years old. In regard to these reports, however, I am not so well satisfied as I could wish to be. Most of our travellers westward are very inattentive to subjects of this kind, and it is very difficult to obtain specific information from them. After making enquiries of a gentleman who had travelled in those regions, many of which he was unable to answer, he told me that he had been convinced, by my enquiries and remarks, of the importance of the subject, and would be more particular in making observations and collecting facts in his future travels. I have recently requested a gentleman residing in the west to give me such information as he can collect; and if he should write me this year, I will communicate it to you.

The ancient remains of works in different parts of the United States are numerous and curious. In North-Carolina is a wall sixteen feet high, and two or three feet

thick, under ground. The question in relation to them all is, by whom were they constructed? for it is evident that they could not have been formed by the Indians.

There are persons who pretend that the original inhabitants of America could never have come from Asia, on account of the breadth of Beering's Straits. They pretend that canoes cannot pass. But this is entirely groundless. Rhode-Island is as far from Montauk Point as those continents from each other; and yet the Indians were constantly in the habit of crossing from one to the other. When Sir Francis Drake was at New Albion, the inhabitants told him that men like his, and ships like his, formerly came to them and carried away a kind of wood which would dye yellow. This wood was probably the yellow oak, and those who went for it might have been the inhabitants of Hindostan. The yellow oak of this country makes a very good dye. New Albion is in the latitude of this country. Imperfect vessels will sometimes suffice for long voyages.

Remark 4th. The burthen of proof lies with the objector in this case. He who rejects the doctrine that all mankind are descended from one pair, must be called on for his arguments to prove his position: his objections are nothing.

Remark 5th. A white boy was found among the Indians on the Ohio river. As nobody could give any account of him, a man who had got possession of him, carried him to his place of residence in Connecticut, and attempted to civilize him. But this he found himself unable to do. He could not govern him effectually.

When ever left alone, the boy would immediately begin to break looking-glasses, China ware, and almost any thing else he could come at. Now if he had been red, you would have said that the reason of his wildness was that he was an Indian. The truth is, that he had acquired Indian manners by living with Indians. The difference of manners in different nations, then, is no proof that they have been derived from different ancestors. The difference between civilized men and savages is, the former love property, and the latter love glory. You can substitute the habits of the former for those of the latter only by Christianity.

Remark 6th. There is no doubt about the different radiating powers of different skins. A pretty intelligent black woman lived at my father's, who, in a hot summer's day, kindled a fire and sat down by it, as she said, to keep warm. On another occasion she slept in a cart exposed to the sun, when it was so hot that either of you would probably have nearly perished.

Remark 7th. It is remarkable that the countenances of savages are not marked like those of civilized men. Thinking changes the face very much: and Indians are never thinking. The eye of a thinking man is fixed. I could mention different parts of our own country the inhabitants of which have faces quite as smooth as those of savages.

Remark 8th. Many negroes are handsome: they have not the crooked legs, curled hair, flat noses, flat heads, &c. which are so often spoken of as distinguishing traits of them all.

DECISION, DECEMBER 30th.

To the question I give the affirmative answer.

On the negative it is urged:

1st. That the shape, color and other external differences of men in different parts of the world are different;

2d. That the origin of the Americans cannot be accounted for, except on the supposition that they have sprung from different parents from those whose descendants peopled other parts of the world.

I. Under the first head I repeat that the first inhabitants of America might have come from Asia; and the probability that they did so is shown by the following facts:

1st. The distance across Beering's Straits is very small, and would not prevent the passage of uncivilized men. 2d. Captain Cook, in one of his voyages, met with savages at sea, six hundred miles from any land. 3d. The dress, the boats, the appearance, &c. of the inhabitants of both sides of the straits are the same. 4th. The traditions of the American Indians represent them as having come from the west, from the shore of the sea. The languages resemble each other. The traditions preserved by some of the Indians of South America prove that they had the same origin as other nations. 5th. Like the Tartars they emigrated in tribes, and their dialects have thus been preserved without mixture. Some of them have been placed in circumstances favorable to improvement, and have made some progress towards civilization.

There is no mystery in the fact that we find the colonies of different Indian tribes all over the country, for they are able to travel with great celerity. I was once told by a person of my acquaintance, that in travelling in the west he observed an Indian on foot, who seemed determined to keep pace with his horse. He quickened his speed very much, and the Indian kept company with him for a very considerable distance. At length he enquired how long he could travel at such a rapid rate; and was answered, that he could continue it all day. One of my brothers was once followed by two Choctaws five hundred miles, for the purpose of stealing two fine horses, in which they succeeded. Indians care little where they go; if they can steal, hunt, or fish. Still I think it highly probable that the first inhabitants of the western continent did not come from Asia. Some of the Phœnician ships may have fallen in with the trade winds, and have been blown to America. The Indians have been supposed by many to speak numerous different languages: but this is not the fact to such an extent as it has been presumed to be. Some of the Penobscot Indians once came to Boston to solicit a stipend. Mr. Timothy Edwards of Stockbridge was employed to hold an interview with them, to learn their wishes; and he found that Hendrick* (an Indian of another tribe,) could understand almost every thing they said. There are not half so many languages in the world as is commonly supposed.

* Whether this man was the famous Mohawk warrior Hendrick or not, does not appear from the notes. As he had a Dutch name, he was, no doubt from the six nations in the State of New-York.

II. Under the second head we will examine the objection founded on the physical differences in men of different countries. If we are called upon to say what they have arisen from, we can fairly say that it is solely owing to our ignorance that we cannot tell. Parents who are brown often have very white children. Why? We do not know. It is of no consequence to ascertain that the color of one nation lies in the middle integument of the skin, and that of another in something else: the color of men varies nearly according to their position upon the globe. It changes in going towards the equator, and where there is a deviation from the regular gradation we can generally account for it. Situation has influence; so have soil, winds, habits, &c. A different temperature, whether natural or artificial, produces a perceptible change on the complexion. We see this often in cooks, whose domestic employments frequently expose them to the fire.

Now the influence of natural causes, whose effects are known, is sufficient to have produced the difference that exists between Africans and Europeans. Their climate is hot, and their habits such as to expose them to its influence. It has been said that the Indians of America all possess the same complexion: but this is not true. It differs according to the manner in which they are brought up. Mr. Williams, the minister of Deerfield, in Massachusetts, was made prisoner by the Indians, with his family, and his daughter was retained by them, till her death. After a few years residence among them, as she conformed to all their habits, she became of as dark a complexion as any squaw you ever saw. On the plains of Brazil the inhabitants have a different appear-

ance from those who dwell on the mountains. But the North American Indians are not white, even in the higher latitudes. The cause of this is, that they are constantly exposed to the smoke while they are at home, and are in the habit of using much oil on their bodies. They also suffer much from cold, heat, hunger, and fatigue. Their mode of life almost makes white people Indians in one generation. In South America, the offspring of white and black parents are said to become white in four generations.

The Jews are found in all countries and are of all colors. The complexions of the black and white Jews, found in the East, present a strong argument in favor of the affirmative of this question. The former, by residing in a warm country for many generations, have become black; while the latter, who have taken up their abode there within a period comparatively recent, have not undergone much change of complexion.

History confines the ancestors of the human race to two. The Scriptures give us reason to believe that the children of Cush were the blacks: "Can the Cushite (that is the Ethiopian) change his skin?" The Cushites have a tradition of their history, which traces their origin to that of men of other complexions. At the deluge all mankind were destroyed, except a single family; and all traditions relating to it say so: so that up to that event there is a general testimony in favor of the common parentage of the whole human race.

Another evidence of our common origin is found in the moral state of man. This is the same everywhere.

Another evidence is furnished by the manner of com-

puting by decades. There is no natural reason for counting by tens; yet we find it practised very extensively by different nations, and it must evidently have been derived from one source.

But after we have proceeded thus far in answering objections, we are asked, where could the first man have been placed, and in what condition, to give origin to all the race? No one can suppose that he could have lived unless he had been created a man, instead of a child. If a man had been first made and placed in a cold climate, he must have speedily died. But suppose he had been placed in a warm one: he must have been furnished by the Creator with all the knowledge and powers acquired by habit and education which are necessary to prolong life. Without them he could not subsist. Lay him on his back and he could not stir; he would not know how. Place him on his feet; he could not walk, he never saw any one walk, and had never learned. Walking is a nice art. Children, you know, learn it only by long practice; and a man would not know how to walk better than a young child if he had never learned. Without observation and practice he would have no idea about walking. But suppose him able to walk: he would starve. He would not know that food would support his strength or his life; and if he were made to know the necessity of food, how can he tell what to use as food? Fruit of certain kinds, or in improper quantities, will kill him. Grain, if eaten without preparation, will ferment and swell and destroy life. But even if he should remain exposed to a hot sun he would soon die. You would say, let him go into the shade: but

he would not know but it was the hottest. He could not eat flesh, for he could not catch animals.

A temperate climate would doubtless prove most favorable to life and health; but even there he could not long survive: for if all the difficulties before mentioned were surmounted, there are winters in temperate climates; and as he would not know the fact, he would be unprovided against such a season, and of course starve.

DECISION CONCLUDED. DECEMBER 31st.

From one of my pupils I learnt the following facts: that four Indians within his knowledge had begun to turn white. He furnished me with their names, and such circumstances as I thought it desirable to know. One of them stated that he had been turning white fourteen years. His hair was partly white, and the skin where it had changed, had the appearance of that of a child. Those parts exposed to the sun, it was observed, changed color more slowly than others.

A man by the name of Henry Morse, from Virginia, once came to my house. He was black, but had been for some time turning white. In those parts of his skin which had changed color there was a little tenderness, and the hair growing upon those parts of his head which were thus affected was not curled. He had enjoyed health all the time the whitening process had been going on, which still continued. From the facts ascertained in these cases it appeared: 1st. That the whitening process went on without any apparent cause; 2d. That all the persons I have mentioned were healthy while it was going on; 3d. That they were not sensible of any

uncommon feelings during the change; 4th. That they were occupied in their ordinary employments; 5th. That the hair was changed with the skin; 6th. That accidental causes render men white, black, or red; and, 7th. That the difference of color or the change of color alters not the man.

Now with regard to the history of men of different complexions we can get no certain information from history of the causes of this difference. We are told that *Adam*, in the Hebrew language, means *red earth* and the Indians say that red men are perfect men. Perhaps the first men were red. If so, they might easily become much lighter or darker in a few generations, under the influence of natural causes. How easily then might the variety we now see among the human race have been brought about in the lapse of ages! The Jews have all the colors of the human species. Wherever they have had their residence for some generations, they have acquired the complexions of the natives. The negroes in this country are growing white. I see a wonderful difference between their complexions and those of their grandfathers.

DISPUTE XVIII.

January 4th, 1814.

Question. *Ought Representatives to be bound by the will of their Constituents?*

DECISION.

With regard to this question, we had better pursue it through its whole course. It will be admitted, that if some of our representatives are to be governed by the will of their constituents all must be. Some are chosen by districts, some by whole states: yet they are not representatives of those districts or states, but of the United States. Representatives sent to our Congress ought to have no private interests, and should be actuated by none, while consulting for the good of the whole country. But as men are strongly prone to feel local attachments, and to give the preference to what they think likely to be of advantage to their own state or district, the representative, if required to obey the will of his constituents, would not be able to act as a representative of the whole country.

But how great would be the inconvenience attending the practical operation of this principle! The electors would not find it sufficient to meet after long intervals as they now do, only to choose their representatives: they

would be required to assemble whenever a question might arise on which their opinion had not been expressed, or if once expressed, might be doubted. Legislatures of the States meet once in a year or oftener, and cause a large annual expense. But what would the frequent assemblies of electors cost? Suppose the labor of each man to be worth two dollars a day. They would debate much: they would sit long; and we may suppose the loss to the country by their being withdrawn from their business to be eight millions of dollars which is a vast sum, though the estimate is made on a very moderate computation.

But the decisions of the people, it is supposed, would be better than those of their representatives. In order to be so, the people must be in possession of all the information obtained by their representatives, (who have sometimes a plentiful scarcity;) they must have all the information concerning the internal state of the country which the President gives to Congress. The Congress, for this end, must send hand-bills through the country, and, with the facts thus communicated, the electors must deliberate and determine on measures. But if there are now difficulties in debating and deciding in Congress, what must arise here? Suppose party divisions to exist as they do at present: the same jealousies, passions and violence would soon be found to arise in the meetings of the people which are seen at Washington. They would not, it is true, in our part of the country, take swords and pistols, but they would use fists and clubs, and many would go armed with the fruit of our distilleries. But suppose the meetings to have surmounted all difficulties, and to have agreed on reso-

lutions. These must be drawn up and sent to Congress from all quarters. When should they be read? If you had two readers a day, it would take two years to read a single set of instructions to the members of one Congress. But before many days you might want new instructions from the people, on the same subject or some other, amidst the changes constantly occurring. Of course new meetings must be attended by the electors, new debates held, and new resolutions drawn up.

But it is probable that these meetings would become rather disorderly, for different men have different views and projects. I was once chairman of a committee in the legislature of Massachusetts, to change the plan of taxation. The committee chose me chairman because I was a new member: for the older ones wanted to get the labor off their hands. When the subject was opened, there were as many different plans as there were men, and each member was confident that his system would be adopted. Now if a representative in Congress is to be guided by the will of his constituents, he will have not only measures communicated to him, but reasons also. Suppose that the plan of holding a meeting on every important question should be found inconvenient or expensive, and that some other should be adopted. The representative must then receive a parcel of papers from each elector who may feel an interest in the subject, containing the opinions of its author. Each of the writings he must set down as coming from a voter, and then endeavor to determine how the majority think or feel from the facts before him. But this may be no easy task. In one case the writer may have embraced circumstances not alluded to by another, and thus the re-

presentatives will find that every source of perplexity has been opened to confuse him. Before he can form a decision, the state of things may be totally changed by the occurrence of unexpected events; and then the whole work must be begun and gone over again. Now as we follow the tail of Europe, we may form an idea how often we might be exposed to the influence of such changes.

But let us look at things as they are. The representative really goes to consult the public good. But is he bound to consult private good? Then he finds himself shut out from consulting the good of the country. He is bound by his oath to consult the good of the whole; and he ought to be guided by his conscience in the way in which he is to fulfil it. Governed by his constituents he is an automaton: the wisdom of man in that case is nothing—you might as well have a barber's block—the wisdom of the representative is nothing, the greatest talents in the community are nothing! What an opportunity would such a state of things offer to demagogues to accomplish their objects!

If you should establish the right in the constituents to instruct their representatives, you would first be obliged to elect a new legislature: every body would not consent to pursue this plan. You must then have your electors throughout the country meet when the first difficult question arises, to form and express their opinions upon it. When the instructions are received, and compared by a vote in Congress, there may be "no vote." The constituents must be informed of this result, and requested to assemble once more, discuss the question anew and proceed again to vote. They might try: but perhaps the success would be no better than before.

I suspect the "wheels of government," as the favorite expression is with some, would stop. The Congress find that they can still agree upon nothing, and they beg leave to rise again, and report once more to the people their Uncle Toby's progress; "one foot up and t'other foot down." Once more the people must assemble; and, before they agree to vote again, they must once more open the subject for discussion. What argument and contest might not be expected to arise by this time! And when they once more transmit the results of their deliberation, the carpenters and bricklayers of Babel never spoke more discordant language than would be found in their instructions.

Yet we are told that without this practice we cannot enjoy liberty. Liberty is a very different thing from what this system would ever produce. Liberty is the right of doing every thing that is right under good and wholesome laws. We are made to be governed. Our people have not tried all modes of government, but they are very much disposed to make changes. They feel like the Rhode-Island man, who was very earnest in making money. One of his neighbors asked him if he did not know that Solomon had said: "Riches take to themselves wings, and fly away." "Yes," replied he: "but Solomon did not believe it till he had tried it; nor will I."

But it will be asked, "shall the people have nothing to do with governing?" The people know whether the laws are good or not by the feeling: by experiencing their operation. If they suffer under bad ones, they must remonstrate. They cannot, however always foretell what laws would be better when a change is desirable. It is necessary to have men of extensive knowl-

edge and experience, as well as men of virtue, to make laws. Theoretical constitutions are not worth a rush. They had better be given to boys to make kites of. It is not so easy a thing to make good laws, or to improve principles. We have among us a species of slang on these subjects, which you may hear repeated about blacksmiths' shops, and markets, and other public places: but it is a very different sort of language from that used by our great men. They do not speak nor act so. No nation ever understood talking in a certain way better than we do.

As to making a change on the subject to which our question relates, it is not to be allowed. That system of government which does the most for our comfort, is best taken up with till we can get a better. One good rule in choosing representatives is this: to elect such as show that they understand the management of their own affairs.

DISPUTE XIX.

January 5th, 1814.

Question. *Is Party Spirit beneficial?*

Remark 1st. "A spirit for differing in opinion" is not "a law of our nature." It is not to be supposed that God would give us such faculties, that by using them aright we must ever be led to dispute truth.

Remark 2d. Dr. Smalley said, a few years ago, in an Election sermon: "Republics have generally been like man who is born of a woman: of few days, and full of trouble."

Remark 3d. Illuminism began in Germany, but was carried to perfection in France. It was the most cunningly devised project that the world ever saw. The fundamental principles of the society were, to bind the members to do whatever was determined to be expedient for the fraternity; and to choose out for their own service all persons remarkable for genius or any thing else that could be turned to advantage. The members, by the training to which they were subjected, were led to murder their own friends in cold blood. Every thing done by this society was done in a masterly way. They communicated whatever they chose all over the world; they got hold on the courts, the

church, the press. The only way to oppose an association like this, would be to establish a society in opposition to it, founded on good principles. The Illuminees would have got possession of the world, if they had not been too certain of success.

DECISION.

Truth, young gentlemen, is the same thing in all cases. It is a perfectly mathematical quantity. So is justice. Falsehood is always the antipode to truth; and the distinction between them is clear and broad. In every question relating to truth, the decision is easy. Such is not the fact with questions on some other subjects. What is expedient it is often difficult to decide; and points often come up in public affairs on which it is matter of doubt where lines can be properly drawn. For instance, suppose a legislature find it necessary to lay a tax. In almost any case the first question to be determined would be: how large a sum ought to be raised? Perhaps it may be thought that a million of dollars will be wanted. But some of the legislators may doubt whether two millions will not be required, or more, or less. There may arise another question: on what shall the tax be laid? And afterwards another still: how shall it be collected? All these must be decided on principles of expediency: and all offer occasions for differences of opinion, and the formation of parties.

But there can be no parties about truth. No man can innocently oppose it. The chief enemy to the universe is falsehood. By a single falsehood the world was destroyed. Every man who practises lying is an

enemy to the universe. Christ said to liars: "Ye are of your father, the Devil." Truth is like Justice. "Fiat justitia, ruat cœlum:" or, "Dicatur Veritas, ruat cœlum." And if the truth is known and acknowledged, how can there be any difference of opinion, or any ground for contrary actions? The truth should be sought and ascertained, and actions founded upon it. Benevolence requires that we pursue such measures as shall produce most good; and the inquiries to ascertain the best course must be directed with fairness and sincerity. Now where is room for parties? It is true we find differences of opinion on all sides; but they are in many cases owing to something else than the love of truth. We agree perhaps in general, but we differ when we come to particulars; we agree perhaps concerning facts, but disagree in regard to circumstances. In the most pure Christian church, where all should be love, there are differences of opinion. The reason is that Christians are men. Questions arise in which they feel personal interests, and their feelings lead them to differ. The same effects we observe in politics; but there is no better reason for them. Why should there be opposing parties among us? Our interests, as well as our duties, are the same. You are an American, and so am I: "let there be no difference between us, for we are brethren." We should feel as Abraham did when there was danger of a dispute between him and Lot. We have but one interest, though we may think we have more.

By this spirit we ought to be guided in all our public concerns in this country, and every measure should be directed by it. You want a tax of a million of dollars: I want two millions. Let us argue the question

cooly, and let the majority decide. If the result should not be exactly agreeable, let us be content. But our practice is very different from this. We are so in love with party spirit, as not to be content with truth. We fancy parties are necessary, when it is clear that if they exist, falsehood must be the basis of one of them. Can God need such engines as lies to carry on his government in the world?

Mr. Jefferson formed the party in this country which is now called Republican. He is a man of sagacity, but I could tell you facts concerning him which would startle you. Before the Republican party was formed, there was no party in the United States: but now we have nothing to anchor us. The question is not now what is the country's good: but what shall be done for our party? An intelligent gentleman, who had travelled extensively in our country, remarked to me not long since, that he had met but one man whom he could call an American. This is the effect of party spirit. Look at countries where it does not so generally prevail. Look, for example, at England, where the people feel a common interest in their country. Here we have now nothing to anchor us: every thing is afloat on a four year's election. To what a state does party-spirit reduce us! To have every man trying to conquer his fellows, without trying to conquer the truth: to see all striving for victory, and forgetful of the public good, is a terrible thing. The influence of this spirit is wide spread and baneful. Rancorous feelings are generated by it between individuals; friends and families are divided; and violence and crimes are not unfrequently the results. To allude to a few instances: a promi-

sing young man who was pursuing the study of the law at Kaskaskias, having excited the animosity of a man against him by some political remarks, in a newspaper, lost his life in consequence. A man rode suddenly up behind him one day, shot him dead and fled. At Lexington a religious publication was set up not long ago; but the editor was so much threatened by some young men of that place, that his life was thought to be in danger. In other parts of our country the same spirit has issued in bitterness. It spreads from Georgia to Machias, and from the Mississippi to the Atlantic. And this is party spirit. It is an enquiry of some interest: is this the manner in which God will be pleased to see us act? Is this system agreeable to his commands? Falsehood is opposed to his character, and party spirit approves of falsehood. Countenanced thus, falsehood spreads. And to what may we not expect it to lead? "Now that truth has fallen in our streets, how can equity enter?"

Young gentlemen, I consider party-spirit one of the greatest crimes mankind are ever guilty of. It has not long been in existence in our land, and therefore its natural tendency has not been fully shown. But I can appeal to other countries, to exhibit its nature and effects. Greece, Rome, Genoa, Geneva, Holland, Switzerland, and many more, were ruined by parties. I do not believe parties ought ever to exist in a republic: I do not believe they were ever necessary. It is sometimes said, I am aware, that those who enlist under different party leaders often think they are combining their influence to produce good results. So may gamblers. The question is not what people may think

or pretend to think: but what is for the benefit of our country? What is it that will preserve us? It may be replied, that we shall yet have wisdom enough, in the midst of any excitement, to ensure our safety. But have not other States pursued this course, and pursued it to their ruin? Yes, and they had the same wisdom which we have.

We may go on and call ourselves independent Americans, boast of our wisdom, and perhaps enjoy prosperity for a time; but we shall stop. Young gentlemen, we are children of Adam:—children of Adam ruined all other states. All the calculations of party benefits are a mere dream.

We should be less exposed to the spirit of party, if our interests could be secured by our laws, without making offices objects of coveting. The Romans were wiser. If we could ship off a few of our office-hunters it might be for our benefit, especially if another brood did not spring up. I wish you to reject this spirit, and consult only the *Salus Populi*. I cannot see how a republic can live with parties.

DISPUTE XX.

January 11th, 1814.

Question. *Is a Savage State preferable to a Civilized?*

Remark 1st. The happiness which a child derives from baubles, is not half so great as that which the parent receives from his more valuable possessions, though some have considered their enjoyments equal. Their capacities are unequal: one's enjoyment is greater than the other, though the child's gill cup may be as nearly full as the parent's hogshead.

Remark 2d. What is the difference between the Hottentot's smearing with grease, and the fop's using pomatum?

Remark 3d. The advocates of a savage life, those who profess so much admiration of its enjoyments, do not show their feelings by their conduct. They do not forsake civilization to inhabit the forests. They are much like a child, whose mother offered her a dish she did not like, saying "it is good." "Yes," replied the child, "it is good, but I dont like it."

Remark 4th. The orations and songs of the Indians show, that they had strong feelings for the strong things in nature.

DECISION.

You will observe that this question has been disputed, and by men of great name: among them we find the Count de Buffon, Mr. Jefferson, and others. I know of but one man, however, who ever put his opinion on the subject into practice. He took his abode in retirement on one of the Swiss lakes. He however lived on the enjoyments derived from civilized society, while he pretended to separate himself from them. He had a strong mind, education, and experience among men, which afforded him subjects for reflection, and occupied his time agreeably: while he was above want, and independent of the seasons and the elements. His life was that of Orlando Furioso. He had no sincerity, and therefore no reliance is to be placed on his declarations. He must be regarded as in the condition of the man who was thus described by an acquaintance to one who enquired his character—"You may believe him," said he, "if you can find another man who will testify that he is worthy of belief."

If I were going to build a house, I would choose the best place I could, and the best neighborhood. I would therefore say to those who argue against the benefits of civilization: "as you, gentlemen, like a savage life, why don't you go and enjoy it?" the fact is, they like a civilized life as well as any body. They are fond of ease, comforts, and refinement in some shape or other, and they would be very loth to relinquish what they pretend to set lightly by. But let us make a comparison between the two modes of life.

The pleasures of life are, 1st. The pleasures of sense; 2d. Those of the imagination: 3d. Those of the intellect; and 4th. Those of the affections.

1st. The pleasures of Sense. With regard to this class of enjoyments, the savage is as poorly off as it is possible to be. He is constantly in danger of being starved. In an unfavorable season, the beans, corn, and squashes of the Indian are destroyed; and what prevents one man from obtaining supplies of vegetable food from his garden, deprives his neighbors of theirs; and savages have no commerce, which goes so far to supply to civilized men the deficiencies of food caused by bad harvests. A commercial nation seek food abroad when there is any want of it at home; and in this way the evils of scarcity are almost entirely prevented. In this respect commerce has contributed greatly to the benefit of man; so that, although we read in ancient history of famines, we hear nothing of them now.

Besides the civilized man cultivates the soil with instruments of improved forms and descriptions: he uses ploughs, spades, hoes, harrows, sythes, sickles, &c. by which much labor and fatigue are saved. But the savage despises the cultivation of the ground, and sets his wife at the task, which she performs at many disadvantages: so that the civilized man can accomplish twenty times as much. Such motives are offered to him, also, to use great exertions, that he cultivates land enough, it may be, to support several, perhaps many families; and this diminishes the hazard of famine still farther. There is always abundance of food in civilized countries where agriculture is extensively practised. In the Northern States we find

that there is always plenty, notwithstanding the large drafts that are made upon it.

It is urged that the savage highly enjoys the pleasures of the chase. It is true: but does not the farmer take pleasure in the cattle he rears? Variety is agreeable; and the variety of food afforded by tame animals is usually greater than that to be obtained from wild. But the supply of food from the forest and the water is precarious; savages often actually perish with hunger. Thus far I have confined myself to the necessaries of life.

When we speak of the luxuries, the difference is so great that it need hardly be mentioned. Look at the garden, the orchard, the lake. Think also of the habits in using food which are formed under the circumstances of savage life. Severe deprivation excites in the savage a voracious appetite; while the occasional abundance he possesses, with his want of skill in preserving most kinds of food, render him inconsiderate for the future and wasteful. He eats to excess, and sometimes ties a belt round him to prevent feasting too much, having no judgment to control his appetite. Besides, Indians often appear to have no preference for one kind of food over another. Some of them are said to have no greater delight than to take a dog, and throw him into a cauldron, and eat him, hair and all. To others no kind of tainted meat seems to come amiss.

With regard to another point, highly important to health and comfort, viz. warmth, the civilized man has greatly the advantage. The savage is frozen. The Indians suffer severely from the cold; and they will tell you so. They will come and beg shoes to keep

their feet from the snow. They come with their skins and buy the products of civilized life, because they find many of them indispensable necessaries. They even make wars if we will not give them the benefit of trade. Mr. Stoddard, a respectable gentleman of great experience and information, used to say, that we have very erroneous ideas of the feelings of Indians in regard to our manner of life. They see and feel that it is superior to their own state, and often avow their preference for it.

Such enjoyments of sense as the savage possesses are precarious. If they sometimes find peace, favorable weather, fruitful seasons, and abundant food, they are liable soon to experience reverses, and to exchange them for privations and suffering.

With regard to health, such philosophers as have considered them in a great degree free from disease, have fallen into great errors. I have had many friends who have lived among the Indians at Stockbridge, and they have informed me that the greater part of their children die. Savages are called healthy because only those possessing robust constitutions survive the privations and sufferings which they have to endure in their miserable life. One of my aunts, who resided at Stockbridge, and was well acquainted with the tribe at that place, told me that it had been found, in cases of sickness, that some of the salutary medicines used by the white people produced injurious effects upon the savages. They had also some diseases peculiar to themselves. One of these was described as resembling the *scab* of Egypt. It would break out upon the flesh of an Indian child, and gradually spread, in defiance of all the exertions

which could be made to arrest it, and she believed it to be incurable. Dr. Sergeant of Stockbridge was unable to cure it. By various diseases many families there were reduced to single individuals, and some were cut off entirely. The loss of life in childhood is very great among the Indians. Men are very necessary to them; and they therefore exert themselves especially to preserve the males: but they have neither the skill nor the means to treat diseases with much success.

It is usual, on a general scale, to estimate the happiness of societies by the number of members. In the year 1663, on a tract of one hundred and fifty thousand square miles, we had a population of fifteen hundred thousand persons. Europe contains from one hundred and fifty to two hundred to a square mile. What then is the amount of the happiness of savage life to the world? You cast off one hundred and ninety-nine parts, and reduce human happiness to one part in two hundred. Reduce men to the savage state, and you make them a prey to various evils, among which is disease, as I have said before, restrained but little by those means which mitigate it so considerably in civilized society: for their mode of life cuts off the knowledge and application of medicines, except to a very small extent. Besides, in the estimate of happiness it is to be borne in mind, that one half of the human race are women; and in savage countries they are ground to the dust.

2d. Pleasures of the Imagination. Savages find an enjoyment in sublimity and novelty: but we are delighted with cultivated nature, and with the contrast between it and features of wildness, as between tilled

land and rocky cliffs. Wigwams are not objects of taste: but we have houses, churches, palaces, and edifices constructed to affect the sight agreeably, as well as for use; and all that our houses contain is formed with a regard to appearance. The events and scenes of civilized life present numberless materials to be used by the imagination, which you will find entertained by its own combinations. The subjects of religion are wonderfully sublime and beautiful; as it teaches us to view things as the works of Jehovah.

3d. Pleasures of the Intellect. Does the boy of ten enjoy as much of these as the man of twenty or thirty? The difference between the savage and the civilized man is as great as between these ages.

4th. Pleasures of the Affections. The advantages of civilized life over the savage are very great here. Love is the pleasure of the heart. It is exerted in several ways: 1st. In the interchange of feeling, called the natural affections; 2d. In religion. Of the last the savage has none; and the natural affections are blunted in him by two causes: they gain them no applause in war, and they think them as low as woman. Of course they will not cultivate the affections, for it is despicable in their view. The savage arms himself against natural affection, rather than seeks it. But to the civilized man it is the source of much pleasure. Think of the enjoyment derived from paternal and filial feelings! There is a great difference between a plant in the forest and in a garden. We are in the garden. The savage, though not destitute of affections, has a coarse kind. All his attachments are gross. Exceptions exist, but they are few. I once visited the Oneidas, and shortly

before my arrival a woman had been put to death. Her husband showed much grief at her loss, and told my son, with expressions of sorrow, that she had been a good wife—very faithful, very kind. But such marks of affection are uncommon. You will sometimes find tenderness in Indian women toward their friends; but their lot is so very hard, as to blunt nature wherever she has an edge.

I have entered upon this point so extensively, because it has not been properly examined by philosophers.

The last thing I have to remark is, that religion forces men to become civilized. Every thing in religion is mild and tender. "Be meek, gentle, forgiving one another."

When I take these views of the subject, therefore, when I see men extolling savage life, and find them taking care to house themselves well, and to sleep on beds of down, I cannot believe them. I am accustomed to consider facts.

DISPUTE XXI.

February 15th, 1814.

Question. *Ought Emulation to be encouraged in Schools?*

DECISION.

It has been the universal custom, in schools of all ranks, of all characters, and in all countries, to encourage youth by emulation. As we find this course practised in the schools of Christian countries, and followed by sober men, it might seem to be the natural conclusion, that it is the dictate of the common sense of mankind. This, however is not decisive of its value or propriety; nor would I form a decision on a subject of so much importance, without an examination of it myself.

Experience will enable us to determine, whether emulation in schools is capable of producing attention to study, obedience and industry: but to fix its moral character we must judge of it by the perfect rule of the Scriptures. And when viewed in this light there can be no doubt of its nature and tendency. It is the duty of every man to act from the best motives: and no motive should be obeyed or presented which is not good.

This subject has been much handled; and it is not to be wondered at that great attention has been bestowed upon it. It is, of course, a subject deeply interesting

to me. I have been instructing youth forty years, and have had my attention long directed to the application of different principles, and the success of different experiments. To guide the minds of the young to right views, to induce them to engage in such employments as will render them useful and happy, to cultivate their minds and implant or cherish good manners and good principles, are unquestionably objects of peculiar importance. There is also a thing of great moment to be taken into view at the same time: viz. that, beside the benefit to themselves, the results will be extensive and lasting. If a number of youth imbibe right views, instead of wrong ones; if they adopt sound principles and pursue upright courses, they will spread them to the latest generations. To know how to accomplish such desirable ends must, in the view of an instructor, be a thing of importance. There are, however, difficulties attending it in great variety, and often of great size, which cannot all be defined. In a school of small children, it seems to be difficult to impress upon the minds of the pupils the importance of their studies; and the fault is not in the studies, but in their minds. The minds of children are fitted to receive certain kinds of knowledge, but not others. You may easily teach them facts: but you cannot well make them comprehend doctrines or remember them. They are also easily influenced by feelings, and by facts: but it is more difficult to make reasoning produce its effect upon them. By what means then they are to be made to act aright, is a question of serious importance. You may tell a child that he will do good, both to himself and others, by paying faithful attention to his studies:

but to make him comprehend what the good is, or how it is to be brought about when he becomes a man, by studying while he is a child, is a business of difficulty. The question then is, what shall be done to the child under these circumstances?

Man is naturally indolent, and especially so in what relates to his mind. He is pleased with variety, and will undergo great fatigue to enjoy it. This is the reason why Indians are so unwilling to work, and are so fond of fishing, hunting and gambling. These occupy a great part of all their time. They are the greatest gamblers in the world, and will gamble away their blankets, and their food, and trust to accident to furnish both. The first object with an instructor therefore is, to overcome this natural propensity to sloth; and the mode commonly adopted is, to point to the child an industrious companion as a model for him to imitate. This may be done in different ways, and we find it applied in various forms in schools and colleges. A child for example is to be taught to spell. This is acknowledged to be a dull employment; and it would naturally appear uninteresting. To excite an interest in it, the child is placed in a column with his fellows, and those who spell right take the places of those who spell wrong. There are some children who would take an interest in the exercise without this arrangement: but they are few. Now you are, some how or other, to compass your object: that is, to teach your child; and it is said that it is better to accomplish the end proposed by means of emulation, than not to accomplish it at all.

To this, however, it is objected, that emulation is

nothing else than a mixture of ambition and pride: both evil passions, which ought not to be encouraged.

There then are difficulties and dangers on both sides. On the one hand we are in danger of not being able to teach children, and on the other we run the risk of doing them great evil, while we are endeavoring to do them good. Here are Scylla and Charybdis. But if there are objections to distinguishing between children who perform their tasks well and those who do not, there are other objections to not doing it. If you excite emulation by telling a child that he has done well, so if you say nothing about it, it will not be known what doing well or ill is. It seems necessary that a child should be informed that he enjoys the approbation of his instructor when he has performed his duty, and that he should not be treated in all respects like one who has neglected or violated it. Even in your own minds, you are not so well satisfied with believing that you have done well, as if I should tell you so. The same then must be true, in a greater degree with children, whose minds are not so mature as yours. Men do not feel so well satisfied with their success in what they have done, while they have no opinion but their own expressed upon it. They feel a degree of uncertainty with regard to their success: they wish to be confirmed by the opinion of others. You feel this uncertainty; and you will find it hanging over you till you are sixty years old. The only way to become satisfied of the correctness of your conduct, in cases in which you feel doubt, is to obtain the opinion of a judicious and sincere friend. Suppose you have made a plea at the bar with which you are inclined to feel

satisfied. You cannot tell how it has appeared to others, until you hear their expressions. If others do not agree with you in relation to your success, you will in vain try to build yourself up on your own opinion. This feeling of distrust in one's own judgment, therefore, does not belong to little children only; and as you possess it also, you may judge of its influence over them. You know how discouraging it is to fail in any undertaking in which you have made great exertions, and how it stimulates you when you have endeavored to do well, to be thought successful. "*Possunt, quia posse videntur.*" Unless a little child be informed of the opinion of his teacher, he will be liable to entertain an erroneous idea of it; and if he thinks he has failed, he will suffer from that discouragement which checks future exertions.

Yet, by distinguishing in any manner between those who do well and those who do ill at school, it is said by some, we necessarily excite emulation. That this effect is often produced I know. The case is one of extreme difficulty. I wish the passion were out of the way, and that we might get along without it. Who can tell me how it may be done shall be "*mihi Magnus Apollo.*" The same difficulties arise in college as at school. Appointments are often given erroneously: for after you have measured the candidates you cannot always tell which is the tallest; and the decisions made are very apt to produce dissatisfaction. I am aware of the difficulties, and have looked about every way to see how I might get round them.

What shall we do? What course ought we to pur-

sue in this college? Shall we give appointments to all? If we were to adopt this course, we should want the long day, which the Chinese tell us was as long as ten, to hear all our public exercises at the commencement. But suppose we should limit each speaker to two or three minutes. Their productions would seem to the audience of equal value with the land which a country-boy told a traveller his father possessed—"Now we are in it," said he, "and now we are out of it." But another plan which has been suggested is, to have private commencements. This has been several times tried formerly, and the country was in an uproar. But suppose this difficulty to be surmounted, and that the public were content with the plan: of what value would such exhibitions prove? Who could know anything about them, or of the character or progress of the students? The college would be a cloister. The students no doubt would say it was a good one, and the instructors would say they had good pupils. I can think of only one more plan, and that is that the faculty should take the exhibition upon themselves. The officers might marshal themselves upon the stage, and do as well as they could. I would preach a sermon.

The truth is, we do not give appointments for the sake of exciting emulation, any more than governments confer trusts and offices for that purpose. Their objects are good, and so are ours. If you condemn us for encouraging emulation, you should condemn a government, by which power and influence are committed to individuals for the public benefit, because evil passions are thus excited among the ambitious. College appointments are conferred for good ends: the principle is

right, but the sinful world, as in many other cases, may make it an occasion for evil. I do not recollect that I ever designed to excite emulation in the mind of any student; but I have often done it. If I never tell one that he has done well, when such is the fact, I do palpable injustice.

Emulation I condemn: I think it is a wicked passion, and the cause of great evil. I wish to see all actuated by this desire: to do the best they can for the glory of their Creator. This desire, however, is not generally found in the minds of the young: and it is in vain to appeal to a feeling which does not exist, so that a teacher cannot excite it as he would. But if it did exist, the pupil would want to know whether he had done well or ill, and would need to be told.

I believe that most good instructors, in distinguishing between their pupils, have no other object in view than this: they mean only to inform them who have done well and who have not. This has always been my object and it is so now. I have no favorites. I know none of the distinctions which are sometimes made between individuals, and are regarded as important. Every one who will do his duty is sure of my good will. I have sometimes told a desponding youth, that he had done well, or was capable of doing well, and it has given him much encouragement.

On this subject I have often reflected. I have attended to all the arguments; and, for aught I know, impartially. I would carefully avoid emulation; I would get along without it as far as possible, and as long as I could: but how we can prevent its existence entirely I do not know, any more than in the state.

We must have government, though government cannot exist without distinctions in society. The evils attendant on emulation spring out of causes which we cannot entirely control.

DISPUTE XXII.

February 16th, 1814.

Question. *Has the discovery of America been beneficial?*

Remark 1st. The Spanish provinces have very few slaves. The natives of the countries which Spain possesses abroad, are generally made use of to perform the tasks elsewhere allotted to slaves; but in many cases they are employed in the mechanical and fine arts. Some of them have risen to high offices in the state. They are, however under laws which, so far as I have heard, are bad.

Remark 2d. The mere calling of anything luxurious makes no difference in the amount of enjoyment it confers. If I take more enjoyment in an embroidered coat than in a black one, you may call it luxurious as much as you please: to me the enjoyment will still be greater. But I might inquire, what is luxury? This is a question difficult to determine. Is eating oat meal or smoked herrings luxury? They may be thought so under certain circumstances. When herrings were scarce, once on a time it is said, a poor family had one suspended over the middle of the table, and while they ate their oatmeal bread were obliged to content themselves with pointing at the fish. Is *oatmeal and point*, (as they call it,) luxury? To some roast beef is not

esteemed as such. Then what is luxury? You may say that it is what is not necessary—what is superfluous. But roast beef is in one sense necessary: for those who eat it are more healthy than those who have nothing but smoked herrings, and still more so than those who live on food inferior to that. This opinion, I know, is opposed to the common belief: but it is a fact, that they who abound in the conveniencies of life, are far more healthy than those who are deprived of them. When I first went to live at Greenfield, I thought that the chubby-faced boys who went out barefoot on the ice, were the healthiest. But I found the poor people by far the most sickly. What is often called luxury is necessary to us. I do not mean that it should not be used with judgment and caution, for it is indispensably important that we should avoid its abuse. Great evils arise from the improper use of luxuries. Sedentary men eat one-third more than laboring men; and yet I believe, after paying much attention to the subject, that they cannot bear one half as much without injury. Students go from their rooms to dinner, eat a great deal, and then return to their rooms: while laborers, if you will watch them, you will find, are soon satisfied, and derive the full benefit from their food. The appetite of the former is a diseased appetite: that of the latter the appetite of nature. You will find men who declaim much about moderation, sumptuary laws, &c. but do you look at their dress and their food, and you will often find that they love good clothes and good victuals as well as any body. Solomon tells us that "it is good and comely for one to eat and to drink and to enjoy the good" (not the bad) "of all his labor that he taketh under the sun."

What is commonly called luxury is no more evil when not loved inordinately, or improperly used, than any other useful thing. Hunting, fishing, idleness, and many things else, are in some cases necessary as well as innocent, and become criminal only by their abuse.

Remark 3d. The wars in Africa have undoubtedly been increased by the slave trade. The old accounts from that continent represent the inhabitants, as comparatively a peaceful people.

Remark 4th. There is nothing in which the Europeans have made more shipwreck, than in computing the population of South America soon after the conquest.

Remark 5th. "Slavism" is not English. If it is ever used, it is not by a workman, but by an apprentice.

DECISION.

Several of you have remarked, young gentleman, that this is a difficult question to answer. There are two species of difficulty which we here have to encounter: one arising from the variety of subjects embraced; another from the necessity of making a computation of things and circumstances which probably might have existed if America had not been discovered. When the question is discussed, those who engage in the dispute generally take strong hold of one side or the other of the subject. One, for instance, takes the slave trade, and tells you that the evils which this cause has introduced, exceed alone all the advantages produced by the discovery of this continent. Another will tell you, that the sufferings brought upon the inhabitants of

South America by the Spaniards, were far more than sufficient to outweigh the benefits conferred on the world by bringing to light a new continent. But these are only imperfect views of the subject. There are many moral and physical evils, and many moral and physical advantages, beside those which have been referred to, which have flowed from the same cause.

I. And first, I will consider the arguments on the negative side of the question.

When the slave trade was established it was believed to have a humane object, and to be calculated to confer great benefits on those transported from Africa. The question was never seriously discussed for a long time, and first began to be examined when I was about twenty years of age. But when we consider it now, how many evils do we see of its production! How many wars may have been produced among the African tribes by the encouragement offered by the slave trade! It is very difficult to form an estimate of the number of slaves made: it is sufficient for our present purpose, that it was perfectly enormous. Besides, it is agreed that about one half of those who were shipped for transportation to America, died on the passage. Here then is a vast and wanton waste of human life, unauthorized by reason and religion. But, beside this, it is to be considered that the worst passions of men are bolstered up by holding slaves; and the amountof this part of the evil effects of the slave trade it is also impossible to ascertain with precision. Some little allowance is indeed to be made, for cases in which Africans brought to America might have been in bondage at home, or have been made more comfortable

here than they would have been in their own country, as well as for those in which individuals have become Christians: but, these are of trifling importance to the question.

As to the Mexicans, who suffered so much from their conquerors, I think their condition has, on the whole, been improved, because they are less slaves now than they were under their princes. They have now their property secured by law, which is incomparably better than to be without laws. The Spaniards destroyed many of them at the conquest: but the number of lives lost has been extremely exaggerated by European writers.

The Abbe Clavigero says, that the Mexicans formerly sacrificed twenty thousand human victims annually to their gods, beside those sacrificed at the coronation of their princes, on which occasions war was always made. Their country has now been in the possession of the Spaniards for three hundred years: and on the estimate above made, six millions of persons have been saved from butchery at the regular sacrifices. This is a greater number, I have no doubt, than the Spaniards destroyed. The lives lost in war in three centuries might have increased this number to nine millions.

With regard to the Peruvians I am not well informed; but I believe that the evils brought on their country also by the Spaniards have been greatly magnified by historians. Some of the views which have been published in relation to the condition of Spain are very erroneous. A writer whom I have read with interest, states, that the evils endured in Spain are less owing

to the king than to the church, by which great wealth is possessed which should be in other hands. A system like this extending throughout the kingdom, shows truly a miserable state of society. The king of Spain, to whom many of the abuses have been attributed, is gulled by a favorite minister, who makes him believe that his subjects are the happiest in Europe. Though his greatest ambition is to kill a deer or to cook a breakfast, he is a benevolent man. When he travels, he is delighted with the appearance of every thing at the inns, for they are prepared before hand. The circumstances in which Spain is placed appear to me sufficient to account for the state of society which there exists. The evils under which she labors, are such as no nation could struggle with. It is often said that the possession of the American colonies ruined Spain, by affording her an immense amount of gold. But the Dutch and the English have both been vastly richer than the other nations of Europe, and their commerce has been a far richer mine than the Indies. It is not therefore analogical to suppose that the Indies have ruined Spain.

With regard to the extermination of the Indians in the United States, to take a general view of its effects, suppose that the happiness of men in a country is proportioned to the number of inhabitants: in a short time after the arrival of Europeans there were as many white men as red. The settlers of New-England long bought of the Indians all the land which they obtained, and gave them as much as the Indians sold it for to each other; and then allowed them to hunt upon it as before. I am sensible that very different accounts have

been given in regard to this subject, but I know the facts. The land, which was then purchased for a trifle, is now in many cases of great value; but this is owing to the change of circumstances. It was really of little value at the time of the purchase.

The first settlers of Springfield, Massachusetts, were eleven in number. One of them was a tailor, and another a carpenter. The carpenter bought a tract of land three miles square, which is now worth a great deal of money. It happened that on one occasion, wanting a coat, he offered to give the tailor either a wheel-barrow or his land to make him one. There was nothing wrong or unreasonable in this offer, or in the tailor's preferring the wheel-barrow if he chose it. The soil, in the state and under the circumstances then existing, was perhaps worth less than the coat. The forest was standing, and it would possibly have cost as much to clear it, as the land was worth ten years afterwards. In some countries water is sold for money. Why is it not an article of trade with us? Because we have an abundance.

The settlers of New-England have been charged with severity towards the Indians: but no Europeans ever treated any nation with half the equity or humanity with which the New-Englanders treated the natives of America.

There are now four times as many inhabitants here as there would have been if the continent had not been discovered; and there is no less of happiness, and no less of morals. This subject I have often reflected on, and have searched to the bottom. I am convinced that

the discovery of the western continent has in this respect proved useful to mankind.

II. In the second place, I shall consider the arguments in favor of the beneficial effects of the discovery of America.

In the first place, the number of people in Europe has been greatly increased in consequence of the discovery. The number of people in a country increases in proportion to the supply of the necessaries of life, which are often limited, although the labor of one-sixth of the human race is believed to be sufficient for the support of the whole. The discovery of America has furnished a large supply of the means of subsistence to Europe; and the increase of population this has produced, we may set off against the loss of lives destroyed by the conquerors.

In the second place, the discovery of America has increased the enjoyments of those native nations of this continent who have survived. Commerce, which has been introduced by the Europeans, has in a great degree prevented famines. This is one of its natural effects: and every man should wish to advance commerce, because in this manner it operates greatly for the benefit of the human race. If commerce were as universal as it might be, famine would be entirely shut out from the world. The great quantity of farinaceous food and fish which we have exported from the United States, has much reduced the precariousness of human existence in distant countries.

In the third place, the discovery of America has made many additions to science, and brought into use

numerous necessaries and conveniencies: such as various medicines, drugs, sugar, &c. &c. The art of navigation has been greatly improved, and the preservation of many lives has been the consequence. A voyage to the West Indies from Europe is now considered safe; and much longer voyages are performed with but little risk. By the numerous discoveries made in geography, we have increased our enjoyments: for the knowledge of it affords us as much pleasure as most of those things usually coveted by man. On our knowledge of geography our astronomy is founded. The science of the earth: the knowledge of its figure, parts, materials and phenomena, is the foundation of our knowledge of astronomy. And what ideas does astronomy give us of God!

In the fourth place, the discovery of America has also improved the humane character of men, and afforded many moral benefits to the human race. It has not only enlarged our knowledge and stimulated our minds: it has not only shed light on important subjects, such as the common origin of the human family, of which we know a great many more facts than could have been known in ancient times; but you will find it useful to observe how the character and moral condition of man have been affected.

This subject will lead you, young gentlemen, into an useful track; and you may make the consequences of the discovery of our continent the theme of useful consideration, even if you do not ultimately decide the question.

DISPUTE XXIII.

February 22d, 1814.

Question. *Is resistance to Government ever justifiable?*

Remark 1st. St. Paul says, that he who resists government, universally, resists the ordinance of God: but he who makes just exceptions does no wrong.

Remark 2d. Taxes are lawful, unless they are unlawfully great, unlawfully gathered, or unlawfully applied. Yet nothing is so much resisted as taxes. I do not care half so much about taxes as about the accumulation of the national debt. Men hate to pay their money: that is the truth about it. When a parish are called upon, by the ruin of their meeting-house, to build another, especially if they have not had a minister for a long time, they cannot possibly do it: they are not able. But it is often the fact, that after a church has been erected, some disaffection arises on account of the spot where it is placed, or from some other cause, and a spirit is excited, under the influence of which more money is obtained, and the people who at first thought themselves too poor to build one, are soon furnished with two, and that without any difficulty. Selfish feelings prevail in a great many cases in relation to different subjects, though principle is sometimes pleaded.

Remark 3d. There is no such word as *preventative: preventive* is what you want.

Remark 4th. There never was a more perfect moonshine doctrine than that which asserts that Adam gave to one of his posterity the right of governing. Whom has it descended to? Whoever will show me the man shall be "*mihi Magnus Apollo.*"

Remark 5th. We admire the Romans: but there never was a more brutal nation than they. They conquered all the countries they could, and all they gave the people in return was their arts, to compensate them for killing multitudes. When they had nothing else to destroy, they killed one another. They had the spirit of a family I once knew, of whom it was said, that they were always attacking each other, unless a stranger came among them, and then they attacked him.

Remark 6th. With regard to Oliver Cromwell, I have some observations to make. I do not justify Cromwell in many things, but he has been thrown down too low by the English. He was a great man and exalted the nation. Charles was a mean-spirited man. I have lately seen some of the letters which passed between the courts of France and England, from which I have derived information. Charles received a pension from France, merely to serve their purposes. I do not justify Cromwell: but the British rail at him. A female writer has misrepresented him to the eyes of our countrymen. There are but two characters in her books: they are all white, or all black. There are no streaked ones among them: whereas the human character is generally streaked. We see no spot: not even a light one, in her friends. She sweeps with two brooms: one is

the besom of destruction, and the other the one which sweeps into the garner. The English, in their dislike of Cromwell, seem to regret the prosperity which he brought upon them.

Remark 7th. Much of the vital religion in England is said to have been owing to Whitefield and Wesley. Religion is now in great repute in that country. This is proved by the fact, that princes of the blood come out and say, that they get more honor by countenancing religion than by any thing else.

Remark 8th. Dixwell, Goffe and Whalley I believe were good men, and they thought they did right: I think they did wrong.

DECISION.

This point has been controverted not a little by sober, worthy men. Paley has endeavored to establish the doctrine that wherever the quantum of good to be gained by a rebellion is greatest, the subject has a right to rebel. This has been thought monstrous. I have paid attention to the question, and have often made it a subject of reflection for a number of years. I observe that the objectors content themselves with declaiming against the doctrine, without entering into a discussion of it. They pronounce it monstrous, without answering it by argument. But we are not satisfied with *dixit* from any man—we receive it only from the Creator. The man who makes an assertion may be very good and very wise, and yet err. "Humanum est errare." Mr. Locke is erroneous in his Social Compact. Though right on many subjects, he has not proved that the mind does not always think, nor that the Social Compact ex-

ists. On this subject, as on all others, I would examine carefully and independently.

It is undoubtedly the duty of men to submit to government: but, is it always necessary to submit? The Ten Tribes departed from Jeroboam, and yet they are not censured for it in the Scriptures. Nothing can be found which clearly proves that God meant to censure them for it; and from the silence of the Scriptures in relation to the subject, it may at least be inferred that the revolt was not considered as a very great crime. The English writers find fault with Paley for making every man his own judge in the case.

Subjects are bound to obey their rulers. St. Paul says: "Let every soul be subject to the higher powers." The only question, therefore, for us to determine is, how far does this duty go? It is certain,

1st. That subjects are not bound to obey their rulers, when the rulers command what the laws do not require.

2d. Men are not bound to obey magistrates acting contrary to the will of God and the Scriptures. This I take to be the true meaning of the declaration of St. Peter and St. Paul, when, after having been released from prison, they continued to preach. "Whether we ought to obey God rather than men," cannot be questioned.

We are bound to fix in the mind the obligation of obeying magistrates generally, for this is a duty except in certain extreme cases. Let us therefore inquire whether a nation is bound to resist rulers when they are seriously encroaching on their liberties. I do not here mean to suppose the people to have a prospect of

acquiring liberty for the first time, but of recovering it after having been deprived of it. I believe that resistance in such a case is perfectly agreeable to the will of God. The question appears to be a clear one; and every nation, in such circumstances, would undoubtedly reason in the following manner:—Despotism is always found injurious to happiness; the fireside is embroiled by it, personal happiness is destroyed; and the happiness of individuals forms the happiness of the country. Each man's happiness is of the same worth in the sight of God, and that of the subject, in his view, is equal to that of the ruler. Should the happiness of a whole people then be endangered for the pleasure of one, two, or ten? In vain are we made children, friends, or parents, if we cannot fulfil the duties of those relations. But tyrants have ever deprived men of this power. They have withered all energy among their people. They have imposed a most abominable system of evils upon religion. Doubtless bad men must be served by bad men, and the influence of evil is extended by them far and wide. Like the damp of the cavern, tyrants have slowly extinguished all life and light.

One example of resistance to bad governors is given by God. Profane history furnishes many others.

Nations are bound to take all possible care of their liberty and happiness.

DISPUTE XXIV.

February 23d.

Question. *Are Theatres beneficial?*

Remark 1st. Nothing can be derived from the moral character of Shakspeare in favor of the stage. He was accused of stealing deer in the early part of his life, and was punished by a magistrate, whom he is supposed to have ridiculed in the character of Shallow. His writings abound with exceptionable passages: and I advise you, if you buy them, to get that edition which is called the Family Shakspeare. Many things should be taken out of his plays. The English have a great propensity to print every shred of their great men. They have published every thing that Dryden ever wrote; and as he lived at a time when society was grossly vicious, his works were tinctured with the taste of the day. I believe he greatly regretted some of his works late in life: but his publishers have preserved all. Such a course is as reasonable as it would be for a man who might wish me to purchase his farm, to lead me through every slough it might contain.

Remark 2d. Christianity has had no great effect on the theatres of England or on those of France. The German plays are "whited sepulchres: full of dead men's bones and all uncleanness."

Remark 3d. Idleness is not merely inactivity: it is doing nothing useful.

Remark 4th. It is not the disposition of men to seek to be loved, but to be admired; and dramatists usually regard it in depicting their heroes. The rake is represented as possessed of every thing that mankind admire. He has gracefulness, beauty, firmness of character, and other qualities calculated to excite admiration; and after a course of immorality, he is generally married to a sober and deserving young lady, and then becomes reformed. Hence it has, to some extent, grown into a proverb, that a reformed rake makes the best husband: that is, strip a fiend of his horns and hoofs and he will make the best man.

Remark 5th. The Jewish proverb may be applied with much force to players, when they argue in favor of the moral tendency of the stage: "Physician, heal thyself."

Remark 6th. The Scriptures do not forbid plays, because such a prohibition in them would have been unnatural. The writers had nothing to do with the theatre, and so it was with their followers. Persons engaged in the representation of plays, in early times, were not admitted into the Christian church.

Remark 7th. Some years since exertions were made to establish theatres in this state. Players and plays were introduced, and many persons advocated them, and endeavored to perpetuate them. Two of my friends were very zealous for the stage, and were convinced that they should be able to reform it: but I argued against it, and laughed at their plan from the first. They said that the theatre would exist in spite

of any opposition, and that a reformation might be made, which would correct its evil tendency and render it useful. After some time, those who had been most warmly interested in favor of the stage began to cool, but were very unwilling to give up the point. About a twelvemonth afterwards I saw both my two friends, when they acknowledged that it could never be reformed. It was but a short time after, when the inhabitants of Hartford no longer permitted their children to attend the theatre. They dare not allow them any more to witness the exhibitions.

DECISION.

Theatres are defended, young gentlemen, as being sources of instruction, sources of eloquence, schools for morals, places of innocent amusement, &c.

As they are principally defended as sources of entertainment, I shall consider them last under that point of view.

1st. It is said that theatres are sources of instruction. What instruction?

In the first place, they afford imperfect exhibitions of human nature. Shakspeare's tragedies are to be excepted from among other plays from this remark: but common tragedies are sullen exhibitions of passion. The facts and circumstances represented are far from the truth. Comedies are generally more like nature.

In the second place, dramas represent characters in situations in which they do not belong: they present vice in garbs not its own, and virtue in deformities which are foreign to its nature. There is sometimes

truth to be found in dramas, but seldom any, and never much.

2d. We are told that theatres are schools of eloquence. They are not. The eloquence of the theatre is the manner of exhibiting unnatural passions in an unnatural manner. The whole influence of the stage is to corrupt eloquence.

3d. It is said that the theatre is a school of morality. I have never read a comedy which a Christian could read without pain, except one: that is the Heiress, by General Burgoyne. Almost all others are grossly immoral. They are such as an apostle would not suffer to be read: and what an apostle would not approve certainly could not be moral. We must not set up a standard of morality for ourselves: it is already fixed; and the morality of the stage must be tried by it. The theatres present in a fascinating light the motives for following the dictates of passion: the very thing which the Scriptures do not approve. They command that passion be not obeyed. The ends of these two courses are essentially different: the one leads to eternal happiness, the other to eternal misery. Now I would enquire of the advocates of the stage, where is your morality in the theatre? They assert, I know, that on the stage you see vice in its natural deformity. So you do in a jail: but you would not take up your abode there for the sake of being instructed by it. I prohibit my children from associating with vicious young men. Why? They would see vice in its natural deformity in their company: but vice cannot be seen without danger. But in the theatre vice is not so exhibited. You season it up, and spice it to make it as agree-

able as possible; and who would not eat it? And who especially of those who go for the very purpose? You dress a fiend in brocade, and offer him to the young for their companion and example.

He who sends a child to a theatre risks his soul.

DECISION. CONCLUDED ON A SUBSEQUENT DAY.

On the former occasion I considered theatres, to some extent, as sources of morality. There are lights in which the morality of the stage is to be canvassed, which I have not yet given you.

1st. The acting of plays adds materially to the sources of corruption which spring in the theatre. Even if the plays were less exceptionable than they are, the appearance of men and women in dresses not belonging to their sex would have an immoral tendency. It is unnecessary to discuss a subject of this nature to any extent; and indeed to pursue it would be indecent here. You cannot but perceive that the frequent changing of dresses, the scenery, the scenes, the language often used, the hour of the night, the favorable reception given by a large audience to every vicious sentiment, must altogether have a bad tendency. You must be sensible also, if not you may be assured, that more powerful impressions are made on the mind by such scenes between ten and three o'clock at night, than at any other part of the twenty-four hours. If you have attended to the state of the feelings in the hours appropriated to sleep, you must have observed a marked difference between them then and in the day time. If you have set up late and conversed with your friends in an affectionate manner till past

midnight, you must have found your feelings more excited than during the day.

2d. You must observe that sympathy is brought powerfully into operation in the theatre. The spectators and the actors are withdrawn from the rest of the world, and shut up by themselves in a large, splendid and brilliant edifice. Approbation and dislike are audibly expressed by clapping and hissing, and the combined sounds increase the feelings in their expression. Audiences in theatres have often become violently excited. All are exposed to the same influences at the same time; and thoughts and feelings are simultaneously communicated to all. Bonaparte is not safe in the French theatres, nor are the royal family of England in those of London. The excitement at a theatre is generally a bad one. The gallery controls the house, and the influence exerted by it is commonly a vicious one. And it is from the love of an unnatural and injurious excitement that the theatre is frequented. People go on account of the scenery, the company, the hour of the night, the splendid dresses of the performers, the brilliancy of the scene, the multitudes assembled. They say that in these consist the advantages of witnessing the performance of a play, over the perusal of it in a book. They do not find at home the same excitement as in the theatre, and therefore they prefer the latter. But let it be shown that they are lawful feelings. Persons in a large assembly will endure language and sentiments which they would be ashamed of elsewhere. Vicious sentiments and language have thus obtained a footing on the stage, and the character of plays has become quite intolerable. I am informed

that such performances as are made in London, even when the royal family and the nobility attend, are perfectly abominable: modest men cannot look on without blushing. It was the evident and rapid corruption of the theatre at Hartford, which led to its suppression in the state of Connecticut.

3d. The actors and actresses are beings as polluted as it is possible for the mind to conceive of. I took up in Beers & Howe's bookstore a book called "The Green Room," which is a panegyric on players by their friends. Every character mentioned in it to which I adverted, was guilty of crimes, not merely of an ordinary description, but such as we call gross and abominable. They would never have been admitted into the society of sober men in this country. A gentleman of this town was in New-York soon after the theatre was founded there after the Revolution, and uniformly condemned the plan, whenever it became the subject of conversation in his presence; and although accused by some with illiberality, persisted in his opinions. He once remarked, that one objection to theatres they could not question, which was the immoral lives of the actors and actresses; and after some opposition they were obliged to confess that such was the fact. This has always been the character of players. The primitive Christians would not baptise them; and in Roman Catholic countries they have been denied burial in holy ground. Rousseau, (and he was not a strait-laced moralist,) says of actors, that they ought to be excluded from decent society.

It will be said that Garrick and a few other individuals of the profession, have maintained good moral

characters. Of these cases it can only be said, that they are exceptions to a rule nearly general. A most popular player in this country was a sot. The vicious character of players has been acknowledged in all countries where theatres have existed. We hear them sometimes called schools of morals: but it is a kind of schools in which Satan has turned schoolmaster, and we may be sure he will not teach our children any thing good.

4th. Who go to theatres? Sometimes individuals of the first character. Respectable examples are sometimes quoted in this country: but this is a poor justification for imitating such an example. Men of character have sometimes become intoxicated, and committed frauds and other crimes: but this does not prove such practices to be right. We are bound to follow Paul so far as he follows Christ: not in his dispute with Barnabas. Error and sin are committed by the best of men; and the Scripture says that though the good man fall he shall rise again. Good men fall when they attend theatres.

Now I observe that almost the whole Christian world have opposed the stage. We cannot well suppose a case in which the voice of Christianity could be more distinctly expressed in opposition than it has been in this: it has been far more loudly expressed against it than against the African slave trade: far more than against persecution.

But of whom does the company attending theatres consist? It is well known to be made up of men some of whom are decent, some are nearly profligate, and many are quite so. And what is the consequence?

Many passages in the plays which excite the cry of "Encore," cannot be read in a decent private company. This is a blot on human nature: it makes a man ashamed that he belongs to the same species with his fellows.

But it is said that ladies of reputation attend the theatre. We know that persons of fashion are fascinated with pleasure, and suffer themselves to be misled far from duty by the current of the world. Many no doubt mispend their time at the play, who, if they had the judgment and firmness to choose better employments might become heirs of salvation. The influence of example has been exerted upon them: they are assured by their friends, perhaps by their parents, that there is no breach of propriety in listening to corrupt expressions or vicious sentiments; they are told that such a practice is compatible with respectable, refined society; and that the tendency of the theatre is decidely moral. They hear the language of vice from the stage, it is applauded by the wealthy and the fashionable: a strong current sets in favor even of the pollutions of the theatre: what shall they do? They blush: they are ridiculed, they are pointed at for their squeamishness. Their parents go—their brothers go—they may hesitate, they may disapprove, and almost determine not to yield: but their resolution and their reluctance are at length overcome, and they also go, with as little compunction, as to a dinner. Many persons there are who become disgusted with the grossness and immorality of the theatre, and forsake it. A few years ago I was in New-York, at a time when the stage was in very low repute. It was so far deserted, that the players were

obliged to suspend their performances, and went to Charleston to await the influx of strangers.

But I might fairly call on the advocates of theatres to prove some of their positions. They insist that the influence of the stage is moral: but they do not prove it to be so by any evidence. If such were its tendency, we should see its good effects. In France the theatres exercise more influence than in any other country: but you might as well undertake any other impossible task as to find morality proceeding from them. It would be like looking for a needle in a sand-bank. Look at the state of the French stage, the character of the players, the nature of the most popular dramas, the audiences and the results. In the theatres of Paris what sentiments are expressed and applauded! The worst principles are avowed, profaneness is familiar to the ears of the spectators; and to morality profaneness is the Upas tree; it kills as far as its exhalations extend.

Can such sources produce good morality? I know of no play in existence which ought to be perused by St. Paul. I would have the morality of the Gospel: I know no other.

And what are the agents by whom the boasted moral influence of the theatre is said to be exerted? They are objects of perfect loathing, and are rendered so by their occupation and their audiences.

5th. Theatres are said to be necessary as sources of entertainment. This appears like an extraordinary pretension, after the view we have taken of the nature and influence of the stage. To admit it would be to suppose that God has not furnished men with sufficient sources of amusement: that he has not allowed them

such means of recreation as may be used without making them worse. If such were in fact the case, I should hope he would not condemn us.

But the arguments above alluded to in favor of theatres, are not those which induce people to attend them. Theatres are very delightful and attractive: here the secret is. If men took no pleasure in them these reasons would not be found in their mouths. We act too much according to our wishes, and then seek to justify ourselves. If man took no pleasure in sin, he would not be sinful: if he took pleasure in holiness he would be holy. But let us take another view of this part of the question.

For whom are theatres to be amusements? For sedentary or active men?

In the first place, for sedentary men the theatre affords a very improper kind of amusement. This class of persons have too little bodily exercise while at their daily employments. Here is a man who has sit too much already at some mechanical occupation, and he sits several hours longer because he has sit too much. Here is a student who has wearied his mind by study, and you take him for recreation, to a theatre. Nothing keeps the mind so much upon the stretch as a play: the feelings are excited, and the attention is fixed. Is this the way to restore vigor to the mind?

In the second place, with regard to active people. Is sitting up till two or three o'clock a way to prepare a man, wearied with labor, for working on the following day? I have always supposed that rest was necessary for an active man at the close of day.

Theatres are not necessary amusements to men either of active or sedentary habits: but I will tell you to whom they appear necessary. It is to fashionable, gay people, who are absolute nullities as to any benefit they ever confer on other men. But I have no interest in amusing such men. If I were king, I would set them at work. I would administer the Holland remedy: put them into a cistern and let in a stream of water; and if they would not pump it out they might drown. I know no charity for lazy people: I know no law which binds us to feed those who will not work. They yawn and gape, and stretch their hands and say: "When will the day be gone?" While they live they do no good; and when they die, they will not be lamented by the world around them. But there are serious objections to the theatre, to which I have not yet alluded. It is very expensive. The money expended on the New-York Theatre alone, would support all the ministers of the gospel in any county in this state. No man has a right to wrap his talent in a napkin and bury it in the earth, and not put it to his Maker's service; and property is one of the talents for which we are accountable. Theatres require a great expense in building, and a continued expense afterwards to support them. Many of those by whom the current expenses are paid are unable to afford the contributions they make. Many not only of the middling but of the poorer classes frequent the theatre. I can give you an example. A friend of mine who resides in New-York was once applied to by a man for a dollar, on the plea that his family had been without bread for twenty-four

hours. He gave him money: but on subsequent enquiry he learnt, that notwithstanding his misery, he was in the habit of going to the play.

In the next place, every person who attends the theatre is greatly unfitted for the duties of the following day. Our duties come every day; and we have no right to render the due performance of them impossible. What person who frequented the theatre ever attended to morning prayers? And who that did not pray ever received a blessing? "Ask and ye shall receive." Who then can expect to receive if he does not ask? I know of no reason for ruining the next day for the pleasure of the night.

But, it will be asked, shall there be no amusements? I answer, Yes: it is a part of our duty to have them. But the amusements must have the following character.

1st. I insist that the amusements have their intended effect. They are to refresh us: this is an indispensable quality. And what further will be demanded?

2d. There shall not be any sacrifice of duty for them.

3d. They shall be lawful in themselves.

4th. They shall unfit no person for a duty that is to come. They are, on the contrary, expressly intended to fit us for duties to come.

But another question will be asked after this reply: What are the amusements which possess these qualities? I am not used to asking for or finding out amusements: but there are many immediately around us and within our reach. To me nothing is more delightful than enlightened society. There are many agreeable and useful employments in which you may engage,

whether in solitude or in company, in which you will find relaxation. I would advise you to perfect yourselves in writing compositions no a variety of subjects: universally, the art of writing. You will derive great gratification from it. It is very delightful as I know by experience. Many of your amusements will naturally and properly be active. I take it for granted that in such exercises you will engage: walks, games, rides. They relax the mind and invigorate the body. Amusements of this nature are gratifying and useful to persons of good habits and intelligence; and a great recommendation of them is, that they are within the reach of every body, and while you engage in them you will neither incur great expense, nor, by your example, bring expense upon others.

If these views are just, it will follow:

First, that it is not necessary to go to theatres;

Secondly, that it is sinful.

These remarks might be carried farther: but I would have you remember two things:

1st. When you go to theatres, recollect that you are to give an account of your conduct at the last day.

2d. Remember the character of the players; that the hearers produce the actors; that we have reason to fear that a great proportion of the actors go to perdition; that the money of the audience is the means of their destruction; and therefore that if you attend theatres, you must consider yourself as instrumental in ruining forever one or more of your fellow-creatures.

DISPUTE XXV.

March 1st.

Question. *Are Lawyers beneficial?*

Remark 1st. I should not use the adverbial substantives *therefrom*, &c. unless in prayer, in deliberative assemblies, and on other solemn and important occasions.

Remark 2d. You will observe that Shays, (for it is right to do justice to him) was not originally inclined to the business of insurrection in which he engaged. He lived in Pelham among a set of bad men: but yet when the question was first proposed, whether the people in that part of Massachusetts should not rise in open opposition to the government of the states, although the public and private distress was very great, and he was one of the numerous soldiers recently discharged from the continental army, he was for some time in doubt what course to pursue. Indeed he for a time opposed the malcontents; but at length was overcome by entreaties to take the command of a company, with a desire, I believe, of doing good rather than harm. He retired to private life after the suppression of the insurrection, and lived in the state of New-York; and the inhabitants of the vicinity with whom he has associated, I am

informed, look upon him as a good man. I make these remarks because I do not think you will ever see a person who will be as great a vindicator of him as I am. I was in the convention of Massachusetts during the investigation of that business, and had an opportunity to become acquainted with the facts.

Remark 3d. Connecticut has not so many lawyers by a considerable disproportion, as several other states. It has generally been said to have a larger proportion: but it is not so.

Remark 4th. I do not agree with Mr. Burke in saying, that law has a greater influence in invigorating the mind than all the other sciences put together. I believe mathematics do more. But I say this of any science whatever: that if any body will spend all his talents upon it, he will get a vigorous mind. Every man speaks in superlatives of what he likes best.

DECISION.

Nations in a civilized state of society have resorted to several different ways to settle disputes between man and man, and between the state and the subject; but it is a maxim that, for the confirmation of liberty, the people should be governed by known laws, suited to all men and to all the cases which may arise amongst them: and not by uncertain laws, whose interpretation and application must be dependent upon the magistrate. Where the laws are just and published to all, each man has a rule for his conduct. But this rule is necessarily not equally obvious to every man. The difference in intelligence, occupations and circumstances of individuals will necessarily render some persons less acquaint-

ed with the laws than others. Some may be familiar with them, and able with facility to ascertain the requisitions of law in any particular case. Others may be so much disposed to obey, that their own judgment and feelings will suggest their duty: while others will be so averse to them that they can hardly construe them aright. To a considerable portion of the community, therefore, the laws become imperfect rules.

The circumstances of mankind present a constant variety. New cases are continually occurring, and many questions must naturally arise which will be somewhat, if not exceedingly difficult of solution. Where there is room for a diversity of opinion, where there is any ground for doubt, in what manner soever the decision may be made, one party will be dissatisfied; and thus men will feel as if injustice had been done them. This will render them restless; and unless they have some standard to which they can recur, they will never acknowledge the justice of what they are obliged to submit to. Such a state of excitement is opposed to peaceful neighborhoods and the good order of society, and is therefore to be carefully guarded against. Our enjoyment always has sought the fireside, and always will. It is not to be looked for in public business, but in the family; and what interferes with public peace endangers private happiness. There are men who will never sit down satisfied to endure what they think injustice, though the government itself should be endangered by their restiveness. To guard against evils of this kind, it has been found necessary to fix on some mode to determine what is just in cases of uncertainty; but there has been a great difference of

opinion on the subject. Some nations have adopted the civil law, and others laws of different kinds. We have taken the English system, which is unlike that of any other country. The laws are standing, fixed, and known, and these are studied and explained by lawyers and judges, and applied by persons of good character and sense, not particularly instructed in the laws, yet familiar with the circumstances of the society, and as far as possible, free from prejudices. Such men as are best acquainted with the laws, it is the custom to call in to occupy the bench; and the judges are presumed to be men of good judgment, and familiar with law. Precedents, established by respectable authority, are regarded, and serve as rules for future direction; and under our system we have all our precedents in open day. I think the principles of the common law are the best the world has ever seen. It presents us several great advantages.

There is a double authority to which you may appeal. You may appeal to your country or to your judges. The judges will be able to tell what is the law, and the jury will decide what are the facts. The judges in this way are a check upon the jury: when the jury would violate the law, the judges may send them out again and again, and insist upon another verdict. This is a great point in our system. The court is bound to inform the jury what the law is, and the jury are bound to make their decision in accordance with the law. The court however should never send them out after they have given a verdict, unless it is clearly in opposition to the law.

With respect to permitting persons to advocate the

causes of others, that is with regard to the question of the establishment of lawyers, it seems to me that it is very desirable and necessary. Without lawyers, it would be necessary that every person engaged in a law-suit should be his own advocate, which would expose him to many evils. One man might be a man of learning, weight of character, boldness, self-possession, or experience in courts: his antagonist might be poor, modest, uneducated, and incapable of doing justice to himself and his cause in the presence of a court and jury. Our ancestors have therefore wisely given all persons a right to choose their advocates; and thus present both parties with nearly an equal claim to talents, and nearly on an equal footing. The advantages of this are very obvious; and after it has been determined that advocates are to be employed to manage causes, the next question which remains to be decided is, who shall these persons be? There is but one choice to be made: between the learned lawyer and the pettifogger. A person engaged in a law-suit will choose out of his neighborhood the man he thinks best fitted to defend his cause. The pettifogger will resort to every trick to impose and circumvent, and will often pass himself off for a man of ability. Now against men of this character I would warn you. Young gentlemen, I have a general abhorrence of quacks in every thing. I have often asked myself whether I was not unduly prejudiced against them. Perhaps I should say that I am most opposed to a quack in the desk. A quack physician puts you to death. A quack lawyer puts the neighborhood by the ears. He examines and pries into private concerns, and excites jealousy and suspicion, and stimu-

lates to controversies, that he may find business and make gain. I knew one who rendered himself so obnoxious by his interference in the concerns of other people, that they resolved at length to endure him no longer, and drove him out of town. The quack physician goes about into houses, talks with ignorant people, pretends to superior skill and science, and belies and defames those who are possessed of real merit. He "leads captive silly women." The quack minister does still worse. He does not know what he talks about, and is of course unfit to instruct or to guide in the solemn and important concerns in which he intermeddles. Some men who mean well, but are profoundly ignorant and greatly conceited, may be ranked among the class of religious quacks. They betray their ignorance, and weakness, and disgrace religion by awkward enunciation, and illiterate remarks, if they do no worse. But there are quacks in religion far worse than these who are grossly immoral, and bring disgrace upon the office of clergymen. They are those who have climbed up "some other way" into the fold. They pretend to what they are ignorant of, and endanger the interests, the most important interests, of those who confide in them. If I take my watch to a man to be repaired, I expect him to mend it and not to hammer it with sledges or axes.

If you cannot find good men in the profession of law, if you must have bad men, let them at any rate be learned, and such as maintain a respectable standing for capacity: such as have a professional character to lose. Bad men, destitute at the same time of knowledge, skill, and the regard of others, would do evil in many ways, in which the other would not. I

would rather have a hornet knock me down once, than have a musqueto about me six months. I don't want to see an ass in the trappings of a war-horse, and hear him bray. If I must have a bad man for a lawyer, I would have an intelligent one. He will cheat me sometimes: a pettifogger will cheat me every day out of my property, and, before I have done, out of my patience and good will if I have any to spare.

It is objected to lawyers, that their occupation and their interest lead them to make business for themselves, by fomenting disputes among their neighbors, and prolonging litigation. No doubt this is sometimes done, and the temptation to such a practice is strongest to those who are young and poor, and at once out of practice and in great need of it. If you are lawyers, I urge you never to resort to such conduct. Wait patiently until honorable employment is offered to you. Your character will by and by become known; and if it is upright, your success will be greater for the delay which you have submitted to. Others will descend to such a course as that which I wish you to shun; but they are little lawyers, and I would not have you to resemble them. The profession of law is indispensable.

In the 1st place. The practice of law is so extensive, and a knowledge of it requires so much study, that no person can possibly acquire an acquaintance with it sufficient to conduct a case, without laborious study; and it is better to buy study in a lawyer, than to perform it yourself when you have need of its benefits.

But you are to remember, that beside all this you are to have judges. These are indispensably necessary wherever there are laws; and if you could dispense

with lawyers and manage your own causes, you could not dispense with judges to decide them. But without lawyers you could have no judges. The study and practice of law as a profession are indispensable to the education of a judge; and these are to be obtained only by the course pursued by a lawyer. How are you otherwise to obtain judges? Will men study law merely for the purpose of expounding it? Suppose men could be found who would pursue this study without emolument: only a small number of them could ever be promoted to office on account of their eminence in that branch; and who, with so uncertain prospects, would ever enter upon the pursuit, and undertake a study which demands so much time, knowing that they were not intended for judges! The truth is, the only way to make men devote their time to it, is to give it to them as a business.

In the 2d place. Your judges are men: and "humanum est errare." If there were judges without lawyers, the former would want that inducement to act with circumspection and uprightness which is offered them by being exposed to the observation and criticism of the latter. Men are not fond of exertion, and generally will not make it where it is not necessary. The man who is satisfied with what will do, will never reach that point three times in his life. He will form a low standard, and be indifferent even about that. But when every step taken by judges is looked to by lawyers, they will have to go by a line. Some of the most licentious men in England, when placed upon the bench, have been very upright in their decisions.

In the 3d place. The lawyers are required to se-

lect and bring forward testimony. This is a difficult subject, and one which demands skill and judgment. The laws of testimony, and the whole system of evidence are necessary to be understood. The courts of England and of this country have adopted the best course with regard to testimony, but one which requires attention and study.

4th. Lawyers form a very important branch of society: respectable and influential. It is asserted sometimes, I know, that lawyers make laws to make litigation. I have been in a legislature: I see that lawyers make the only unexceptionable laws. I would not give a groat for one which was not made by a lawyer. If you were to exclude lawyers from your legislature, your legislature would be lame. Other men, ignorant of the purport of language when applied to laws, and of the operation of legal principles, cannot be trusted with making them: you must at least let your lawyers inspect your laws.

5th. Men educated to the profession of law are naturally led to converse with practical subjects more than others, at least in this country; and you will observe that in the United States many of the statesmen are lawyers. Their business leads them to speak in public frequently, and constant exertion and practice render them capable of doing it well. Beside this, the lawyer understands the whole system of jurisprudence, and he should understand also the law of nations. He who is entirely confined to the bar, it is true, will be a very imperfect statesman; but if he learns every thing well which he has an opportunity to learn, he will be a good one.

It is a very common imputation charged against lawyers, that they are exorbitant in their demands: that they ask too high fees. They do not follow the same rule which a laborer adopts, who is paid by the number of hours or days in which he works; nor ought they. They should be repaid the expense of their education, and receive some compensation for the pains they have taken in acquiring it. A school master is paid for the time and expense which the acquisition of his knowledge has cost him, and very properly too. A physician sometimes makes high charges for his professional services; but it is to be remembered that he discriminates between the rich and the poor. He attends to the indigent in their necessities, he affords them council, care and medicines. They cannot pay, and if he should depend upon them he would be entirely unrewarded. The rich ought to pay for the poor. The physician has a right to demand for it. What he has done is a benefit to the individuals, but not only so, it is also a favor to the community. It has saved, or partly saved the necessity of contributions for their support. He has done more good than we have done after we have given money in charity.

Now let us observe how the lawyer is situated in this respect. Ought not the same principles to be regarded in paying him for his services? Are they not regarded, and do we not find them acted upon? I wish to go to a lawyer, to take his advice on a subject of importance to me. There is one who would ask twenty dollars for it; and another, who, although he might devote but a short time to the consideration of

the question, would ask forty. I consult the latter, and readily pay him his fee. For what? Not for his trouble: but for his advice, which is really of greater value to me than any the other could give. Some persons pretend that the profession of a physician is more lucrative than any other employment. There are instances in which lawyers become very wealthy: but it is far from being the fact universally. Take them together, and compare their condition with other persons. Farmers in this state, I believe, are generally richer than lawyers. The merchants are richer than the lawyers, as a body. Why should they be? What renders the lawyers of less value? And yet that they are inferior in wealth is undeniable. We may fairly decide, after an investigation of their circumstances, that they are far less wealthy, not only in this particular part of the country, but in New-York, Philadelphia, Boston, and other principal cities.

There are among them men who will take opportunities to oppress others; but this is the fact also in all ranks of life. Lawyers are a necessary component part of civil society, and are capable of being very valuable members of it. No man can assist the poor so well as a lawyer; no man will do it so often, though he gets nothing for it. The lawyer stands between the oppressor and the oppressed. There was one case I might mention, out of many, in New-York, in which a lawyer displayed great generosity. A man was suffering under the oppression of an enemy, who had involved him in a serious and expensive prosecution: when the lawyer stepped in and protected him, like an undaunted champion.

The lawyers, as a body, are men of worth. The common clamor against them I despise. It all amounts to what was said by a person against Judge Reeve. After having indulged in many severe expressions against all of his profession, being once engaged in a law-suit, he applied to him to defend his cause. "But," said the judge, "I thought you had a very bad opinion of me." "I do indeed hate lawyers," replied he, "but not you." The judge inquired whether he hated this and that man, and in fact any particular one? He replied however in general terms, that he hated all. There are many who have these general prejudices without a reason to give for them. As for such general aspersions as are cast on those whose profession is the law, I would recommend to you to despise them. They are too common.

The lawyers in this state are generally respectable men: yet that the profession exposes men to temptations, is true. If you are lawyers, determine you will not yield to them.

DISPUTE XXVI.

Question. *Which is more conducive to Literature, a Monarchical or a Republican Form of Government?*

Remark 1st. It is often said that property is more equally divided in a republic than in a monarchical country. This is a mere chimera. Some of the richest men in the world are in Holland, while there are also many poor enough to be day-laborers, and others who are paupers. The truth is, in no countries is the distribution of property so unequal as in republics. In this country we talk a great deal about an equality of rights: but look at Virginia, where as much is said of it as any where. You will see a nabob there as truly so as you would find in India. He will talk about the equality of rights, as a state of things to be found only in a republic, while he has ten or twelve negro slaves waiting at his table.

Remark 2d. You will observe that not only the government of Great Britain, but individuals in that kingdom, are more desirous of assisting literature than in this country. The most we have ever received in this college was four thousand pounds sterling. In England an individual has recently built and endowed

a college himself, at an expense which exceeds the whole amount of money ever given by individuals in the United States to all the colleges they contain.

Remark 3d. There are very few men in England who will study at their own expense. Those who apply themselves for life to literary pursuits are supported by fellowships endowed for that purpose. In this college we have very little to offer to poor students. The state will not give us so much as a house to teach in, although we are much in need of one. In Massachusetts there are men who give money to literary institutions.*

Remark 4th. A very respectable minister in this state, who had a relation worth half a million of dollars, once requested him to educate a young man of good character, whom he recommended. He replied that *he would think of it.*—Go on young gentleman.

Remark 5th. There are few motives held up in this country to authors. There is little encouragement offered for any kind of writings except political pamphlets and religious books. The former are numerous; but there are more religious books sold than any other, a great many times told.

Remark 6th. Science is at a very low ebb in France. One of the members of the Royal Institute confessed that he was unable to write a system of morality. He acknowledged that the system adopted in France was indefensible; and when asked what mo-

* Large contributions have since been made for several colleges in the United States: particularly Yale College.

rality is, he drew a comparison between the morality of France and that of England, and did it in a masterly manner. In a disquisition which he wrote on the subject, he declared that the foundation of morality is disinterestedness: but this was not a doctrine to be relished by the government; and as soon as the work was published it was suppressed. The government is wholly a selfish one, and would not receive the doctrine of disinterestedness.

Remark 7th. There is a general odium thrown upon pensions by our countrymen. It is because the English, before the revolution, wished to make us support some of their pensioners: the odium is not thrown on pensions in the abstract. I hate to see men, worthy of condemnation, supported by their government: but I cannot bear to see Gen. Sinclair perched upon the Allegany mountains, keeping a poor tavern. It makes me feel much as if I had a razor drawn over my heart-strings—I can't get rid of it.

DECISION.

The question is one concerning fact altogether. We only ask, in general, abstract language, whether monarchies or republics have in fact been most favorable to literature. There is no absolute principle by which we can determine that one or the other will prove more favorable to learning.

We know that all the actions of men are regulated by motives; and that there always will be found men to perform any thing that is greatly wanted in a country, if the motives to induce their accomplishment

are very great. The French have held out motives for military officers; and what has been the consequence? Military officers have always been found in France when they have been wanted, until lately, when so many of them have been destroyed, and there has not been sufficient time given to raise up new ones. The Romans always had generals and officers enough. The British have never been in want of admirals: and since they have begun to hold out encouragement for land admirals they have found them. In England motives have always been held out in law and theology; and neither jurists nor clergymen have been wanting, unless when the prince has preferred not to have them. There have always been enough government men in that country, because the rewards offered them have operated as powerful motives. The same result will always be found wherever sufficient motives are held out to men to distinguish themselves in any department. Wherever you start motives you start men. In this country we have given motives of profit to encourage mechanical inventions: we have given a thousand patents; and many of them are for very ingenious contrivances. In Greece, beside being great in war, they held out motives to writers. Their poets rehearsed their productions in public, in the presence of persons assembled from all parts of the country; and he who excelled was crowned, and enjoyed high distinction. By these means a strong incitement was offered to poets to strive for excellence.

When therefore you ask the question: which is more favorable to literature, a monarchical or a republi-

can form of government, you ask which holds out the most motives to literature. Leo the Tenth ransacked all Europe for literary treasures and for literary men. He determined to protect learning: it was his darling object, and he found abundance of men to perform what he projected. How different was this from Bonaparte's conduct! He does not encourage literature, although some would have us believe that he is liberal and friendly to it. He encourages certain branches of science: such as he can derive benefit from without being exposed to danger. In all his plans for the patronage of learned men you will observe two things at which he aims: one is to obtain power, the other is to have his pride flattered. He discountenances all men who discountenance his power, while he lends a willing ear to flattery. A French writer who attempted to show that Rome was far more happy under the emperors than during the republic, obtained much favor from the Emperor, for Bonaparte extended encouragement to him. He patronizes chemistry, for by it the art of war is improved, and with its aid he may be able to destroy those who oppose him. Certain arts are also encouraged by him, and such as have been useful to him in accomplishing his schemes have therefore flourished more in France during his reign than at any other period. He extends encouragement to such things by showing that those who perform them have his approbation, and this excites them to do more. It cannot be said that such direct encouragement has been given to any object in England, to any extent. The king of England has encouraged various branches

of art and science, but not in this manner. The University of Gottingen has been supplied with fifty professorships; and as soon as it is determined that a new professorship is wanted, it is founded.

The British nation have given their countenance capriciously. The truth is with regard to great men, that they are almost all poor. Dryden died a beggar; Otway starved; Butler died in jail; Milton was worth about sixty pounds sterling at his death, fifteen of which he got by his Paradise Lost; Pope died in the possession of wealth furnished partly by his writings; Addison was in possession of a good estate; Johnson received, at the age of fifty-three, forty pounds a year for life, which was necessary for his subsistence. His Rambler lay on the shelves for years. Fashion turned it up, and it went with the stream. It would not at first pay for printing, but his bookseller said it would one day sell.

Reynolds, the painter, received much money for his productions; Garrick died rich; Hawkesworth wrote the life of Captain Cook badly, but it sold. The English have been far from encouraging living authors: far less than we should expect. There has never been that settled opinion concerning literature at large in that country which Leo the Tenth brought about. The English, however, have done many things to encourage learning, though in other respects they have been deficient. Their institutions are well endowed, but they are not conducted on the best plan. They are defective in not requiring many of the professors in their universities to give lectures.

In this country we speak of our colleges both as colleges and universities, when they are neither. They are collegiate schools, such as Eton. There the students write Latin, Latin verse, Greek, and some of them Greek verse. In this college it was formerly the custom, at morning prayers, to have a senior read into English a chapter in the Hebrew Bible. In the evening, a senior read a chapter in the Greek New Testament. While I was a tutor I never heard a tutor speak to a boy, or a boy to a tutor, in any thing but Latin. We do not make the progress we ought in the standard of studies. We have never proceeded a point in the requisites for a youth to enter here, since this was a collegiate school; but this is owing only to the want of power. We want nothing but endowments. We want means to aid poor students: the rich can help themselves. We are now going up hill, it is true: but we have proceeded but a little way. A little while ago we were considerably behind in several branches of study: all philosophy, logic and mathematics, were to be thrown out in our course of education, except such portions as are perfectly easy of acquirement; and it is but lately that we have become so expensive in our course as now. When I was in college, a student went easily through the course of study, for four hundred dollars. We have still no fellowships, no scholarships; and as for the professors, they are so much occupied with their duties, that they have not time to attend to speculative knowledge. There is nothing in this country like a fellowship, except in Cambridge, where about a dozen young men are furnished with the means for studying

theology. In England there is a vast multitude of fellowships; but here there is not sufficient attachment to learning to afford them. Our ancestors were liberal. They gave a considerable sum annually to this college: they built the chapel and most of the middle college. We talk a great deal about liberality, but I wish we acted more about it. We are not a liberal people. Our ancestors gave to President Clapp fifteen hundred pounds, which was worth three or four times as much at that time, as the present salary of the president and professor of theology.

And why should men be so unwilling to give property for the support of learning? A man will do his children no good by leaving them money: he will do them far more good by giving it to an institution in which they may be educated, and the useful influence of which they may enjoy. This truth is acknowledged by some few men among us, and practised upon; but by only a few. It is done to some extent in Boston, New-York, and Philadelphia. There was a man of whom I knew something, who had a considerable estate left him by a relative. What did he do with it? I will tell you. He went to Butler's,* sat down to dine, and while at table spread a piece of bread and butter very neatly, then laid a one hundred dollar bill upon it, and ate it. He thought his property was an ocean; but it was a pond; and it soon ran out and evaporated.

However painful it may be to make such a declaration, truth requires me to say that we are not liberal in the support of our institutions, and that we do not

* A large Inn at that time in New-Haven.

properly appreciate the value of knowledge. I have been mortified by the fact a long while. I hope you will see better times: I never expect to see them myself.

DISPUTE XXVII.

March 9th, 1814.

Question. *Would a Permanent Navy be beneficial to the United States?*

Remark 1st. The castle Moro, which defends the Havana, was thought to be absolutely impregnable; but when it was attacked by the English, they sent up several ships against it at first, by which it was bombarded; and when these were disabled, they sent more, until at length the castle was battered to pieces. This success was considered as settling forever the fact, that fortifications are absolutely indefensible against ships.

Remark 2d. England has not a surplus of population, for the numbers have been considerably increasing for a considerable time. I take it that the population of a country increases in proportion to the means of subsistence. Now in England, a great many millions of acres are entirely waste, and a great many millions more are very poorly cultivated. Beside this, a great deal of land is taken up for parks, forests, and ornamental grounds; and surely the enormous possessions of individuals in that country are in general not favorable to population.

Remark 3d. If you shut up to the poor the way

for obtaining property, you oppress them as truly as if you prohibited them from obtaining it.

DECISION.

Themistocles was the first man among the Greeks who seems to have understood the usefulness of a navy. He became acquainted with it through the Tyrians; though there were probably other sources from which he derived a knowledge of its value. Being convinced that his country must depend upon the fleet, he went to Delphos, and bribed the priests to tell the Greeks to betake themselves to their "wooden walls." They understood the expression as was intended, went into their ships, and Themistocles ruined the fleet of Persia. From that period the world has been a theatre of maritime war. The question before us, however, has never been so clearly settled as in the cases of Holland and England. Holland was originally inhabited by a few poor people, who lived on fish; but by their industry and perseverance, they protected their country from the encroachments of the sea, and rescued from the water large districts, which nature had rendered entirely useless. Being oppressed by the Duke of Alva, they rose in a general revolt and drove out the Spaniards, after they had retained possession of their country for a course of time. Assisted by Queen Elizabeth, they raised a fleet; and after the English had humbled the Spaniards, Holland followed them up, and did them much injury. After this the English overcame the Dutch, and they have ever since had the superiority.

Experience has shown that a fleet is the best de-

fence for a country. President Adams deserves to be had in remembrance for his nucleus of a navy. It was small, but it was prepared to watch the French, and produced the effect of frightening them. Whatever efforts have been made by us with fleets, the battle at Tripoli, and the events of the present war have convinced the Government of our country of the advantage of a navy. All other nations who have had fleets confirm the same thing, particularly the British. In our own country the question of the value of a navy has been regarded not as a matter of experience, but of speculation; and in discussing it, it is best for us to follow the plan adopted by others.

The objections to our building a permanent navy are the following: 1st. That we are not able to build one; 2d. That the British have become enfeebled by possessing one; 3d. That we must experience the same evil, if we imitate their example; 4th. That commerce, which it is the principal object of navies to support, is of no use to a country, but a source of continual turmoil; 5th. That seamen are always men of corrupt character, and would corrupt the country.

Perhaps other objections beside those I have enumerated are made to our constructing a navy; but these are sufficient for our consideration at present, and I will proceed to examine them.

In the first place. With regard to our ability to construct a navy, I may appeal to Mr. Jefferson's notes on Virginia. He says that that state can build a seventy-four every year. On this evidence I will not strongly insist or rely, as it is only the expression of an opinion; but I appeal to stubborn facts. The Dutch, when they

began their career as a maritime nation, were not more than one-third as numerous as the inhabitants of the United States; they were not half so wealthy; they were at war; and had great impediments in obtaining articles necessary in building and fitting out ships: their country produced no timber and no tar, though it yielded hemp and perhaps flax—yet they built a fleet, and humbled the Spanish power. They not only successfully resisted their enemies, but they made important foreign conquests: captured Brazil and almost all the Spanish Indies. Now I ask, can two millions of Dutchmen do more than six millions of Americans? We are not only much more numerous, but we enjoy other decided advantages over the Dutch at the period when they commenced the construction of their navy. We are at peace, and are exposed to no interruption or embarrassment in our proceedings. Our country abounds in timber, and yields live oak: the best species of wood for the frames of ships in the world. We have good materials of various kinds, skillful mechanics and excellent seamen. What is the reason then why we are arguing against the construction of a navy, when they, by their promptitude and wisdom, possessed one, and established their national prosperity? Why, we are Americans, and they were Dutchmen. They undertook the task, and we will not. I think very highly of the Dutch; but we can do as well as they. Away with this story of our inability! There is nothing more in it than in the excuse so often made by boys for neglecting a task which they ought to perform. "I can't do it." It is only because we will not.

In the second place. Another objection which we

hear made against a navy, is, that the men who will be put on board of it will corrupt our morals. There is no doubt that morality is at a very low ebb in navies; but it is true also, that there has never been a fair experiment made in ships to elevate or purify the character of seamen. Some exertions have been made in England, and to some extent, here. If the captain of a ship is a wicked man, you do the men much harm by placing them under his command; and if there is no religious worship established on board of a ship, as is often the case, what can be expected? Men will not be moral who have no religious worship, to remind them of their duty and to instruct them in it. The father of a family finds it indispensable to have the daily worship of God performed in his house; and the commander of a ship, for the same reasons, must introduce it on board.

A ship will be what the commander chooses to have it. Captain Tryon's ship, in the revolutionary war, was perfectly orderly. Captain Pearson of Newburyport, who commanded a ship, gave me an account of the state in which it was always kept; and the rules which he caused to be observed on board rendered it more orderly than most of the families in the country. The truth is, that the master of a vessel at sea has his men entirely under his command; and from the circumstances of the case, foreign influence is cut off. The only bad examples which can be presented will be on board; and these of course can be controlled. Beside this, the commander has it in his power to show so much kindness, that he has opportunities of gaining the attachment of his crew. There are no men more

beloved by mankind than captains at sea. Their attention is not liable to be much drawn away from the care of their men, so that other occupations need not prevent them from devoting sufficient regard to their crews. If one is a good man worthy of his station, he will have nothing to do but to sail his ship and to see that his men are taken care of. The current remark, which is too well founded, that the crews of national ships are not properly regarded, reflects upon those who choose the officers. Instead of there being any necessity for seamen being bad men, there are many reasons why they should be good. A meritorious officer has it in his power to do much good. He can reform more men than a man in any station or situation on land, with the exception of a small proportion perhaps of clergymen, who enjoy uncommon advantages and possess a strong influence. But there should be good men placed in our ships as officers; and, if we had them, good effects might be produced, even if there were no chaplains on board. Chaplains, indeed, such as are often sent out in ships, do harm. We had one during the war, on board a ship I knew of, but he had nothing belonging to a chaplain except the name, and was no more like one than any man you will meet between here and the end of the wharf.

General George Staunton says, that profaneness is to a considerable extent banished from the British navy—I do not mean that it has ceased to prevail to too great a degree; but that it has been extensively checked. Yet I believe the exertions yet made to suppress it have not been very great. Attempts are making in England to improve the morals of the navy in differ-

ent ways, and the success has been encouraging, particularly in the distribution of Bibles. They have been received with great eagerness, and have already proved very useful. Admirals and commanders, as well as generals and noblemen, have been influential in spreading Bibles throughout the world.

But we must enquire, what is to be done in this country to provide for defence, if we reject a navy. You will remember that the alternative of this is an army; and, if the objections above mentioned are made against the former, they will apply with far greater force against the latter. For, first, the soldier is a great deal more exposed to temptation in various forms; second, he is not under the eye of the commander, and the commander does not acquire the same interest in his welfare or his conduct.

The commanders of ships have almost unlimited power over their men; and, from the circumstances in which they are placed, they can more easily secure their affections than the officers of an army. Soldiers are not cut off from intercourse with the rest of the world; they are exposed to the temptations of others around them; and while they are corrupted by bad influences, they corrupt others by their own example. In some respects soldiers will be found, if we consult facts, to have been productive of far greater injury to countries than sailors.

In the third place. As to morals, there is no debate between the comparative moral disadvantages of armies and navies. There are great obstacles presented in camps to the cultivation or preservation of morals; but if sailors are not rendered moral, it is your own fault.

In the fourth place. Fleets have never been the means of destroying the freedom of countries. Seamen have always been submissive to laws, and guardians of liberty; but armies have almost always been the destruction of countries. The exceptions to be made in the latter cases are as few as those in the other.

In the fifth place. Soldiers will not work. Army officers discharged from service are not among the industrious citizens. They have always been gentlemen and idle; and they feel dissatisfied with any condition in which they lose their consequence by remaining unemployed. Disbanded armies, therefore, often prove the sources of immense evils to their countries. In this respect there is a wide difference between navies and armies. Ships cannot sail over land; and, notwithstanding the recent experiments of two or three gun boats, I believe they never will. Ships are confined to the coasts and navigable waters, and cannot hurt the interior if they would. If a navy, therefore, is directed against the liberties of a country, the inhabitants can escape, and rejoice in the power they have to escape.

In the sixth place. The question of the comparative waste of lives among seamen in fleets and armies on land will not admit of debate. The men with whom Lord Nelson won his great naval victories would hardly have formed a corps, if brought into an army. Comparatively only small numbers are necessary in naval operations, and for this reason an engagement at sea destroys but few lives. The battle of Trafalgar killed only two thousand of the English. Not only is the waste of life smaller in actual engagements, but there is less exposure to die by dis-

ease in a fleet than in a camp or on a march. It was a remark of General Moreau, (showing that a nation must acquire its knowledge of war only by experience,) that on first engaging in a war, they must enlist an army and see it perish before they can know how to manage one. Men brought into a camp are exposed to a variety of diseases, and fatal ones too; but the only cases in which seamen have been destroyed by diseases, has been when they have been contracted in consequence of long voyages. Among our ships accidents which destroy life are of rare occurrence; and men will generally be no more exposed to death in times of peace in ships of war than on land. The air at sea is peculiarly healthful; seamen are free from consumptions, and a large portion of our deaths on shore are from this source. Colds, which kill half the remainder of those who die among us, are hardly known to seamen.

In the seventh place. With regard to the expense of supporting armies and navies: there will not be one half the expense in raising and supporting the latter, which there is in keeping on foot the former. Observe that our exposure is at the sea-board: of course there must be our preparations for defence. If a man should come to break my front door, should I go to my kitchen door to fight him? Mr. Randolph, when he had some peculiar notions of his own, would say: "I would meet our enemies at the strand, and fight them back to the Allegany mountains." A great deal has been said about our courage, and of what our troops would do in different cases. But it is impossible to defend a coast like ours at every point with troops, and

all that is said about our courage being sufficient to make up the deficiency is idle. If a fleet should come unexpectedly to many parts of our coast, a landing would inevitably be made. The inhabitants of the neighboring country would assemble, and offer what resistance they might; but no very powerful force could be collected, with sufficient promptitude to prevent the enemy from accomplishing their objects, or from re-embarking.

A great part of our country would be unable to victual an army. General Washington was five months at Valley Forge, in the productive state of Pennsylvania; and he found himself so much straightened that he wrote in one of his letters that provisions must be sent to him: for that part of the country was exhausted.

DISPUTE XXVIII.

March 10th, 1814.

Question. *Would a National University be beneficial?*

Remark 1st. It is difficult to tell how many students there are in the universities of England. Mr. Silliman, when at Oxford, dined with several of the officers and professors of the colleges, and enquired of them what were the number of students attending that year, but received in reply, that they were perfectly ignorant. They could not even tell how many belonged to their respective colleges. I should doubt whether the number is not generally exaggerated. You should not depend upon such accounts as you may hear respecting this subject unless you can get the particulars.

Remark 2d. The first reason why our countrymen do not make books is, that the English make a great many: the second is, that those made in this country must be dearer; and the third is, that on account of public prejudices they would not have so much reputation. I wrote a statistical account of this town, which I suspect was as popular as any pamphlet ever printed here; but its sale was very small. The Connecticut Academy have obtained statistical accounts of thirty or

forty towns in the state; but, for the want of patronage, they cannot print them unless they would pay the expense themselves. A thing which is disreputable to this country is, that the inhabitants of one state do not feel any interest in the literature of any other. The members of the French Institute correspond with the fellows of the Royal Academy of England now as cordially as if it were a time of peace. The temper of our people is in the last degree unfavorable to literature.

DECISION.

General Washington gave a large quantity of land for the foundation of a National University in the city of Washington, which city was at that time expected to be a place of consequence. He advised the public to establish such an university, which is not a proof of the sound good sense which he possessed. It must be remembered, that he was not educated at an university; and it is to be presumed that he was not intimately acquainted with this subject. He would certainly have felt differently about establishing an university in a large city, and at the capital, if he had ever exercised the government of one. There is hardly any thing farther from the truth, than the opinion that every sensible man is able to manage an university; and men without experience are unfit to form as well as to govern one. Every blacksmith has had an apprenticeship; and does not the president of a college require one? A tutorship is a kind of apprenticeship. On this subject I can give you a fact.

It was formerly the practice to govern the students of this college by a kind of municipal law, according to

the old plan practised in England: but I introduced the system of a parental government. The importance of this change presented itself to my mind while I was a tutor, and I made an experiment at that time which satisfied me that it might be easily accomplished. Neither I nor my fellow-tutors ever fined a student. The fines at Cambridge amount to about eight hundred dollars annually. My three first classes I governed by the eye and the tongue. It struck me that the youths who came to college were like other youths of the same age, who are found to be manageable by the parental system of government at home. Parental government is approved by mankind generally—and, having stood the test of experience, may be presumed to have been proved efficacious. This system was therefore introduced here in place of the old one, and with great benefit. The opinions of other men engaged in the government of colleges in different parts of the country, to whom I have recommended the system, have been favorable to it. They say it appears to them to be the only rational plan. Now if it is a fact that it is the best, which I will suppose it to be for the present, it is a remarkable fact that it has been approached very slowly. All that I know concerning the subject, I have acquired by experience and reflection. To educate youth has been my business in life: in it I have spent forty years, and find that experience is as necessary in this employment as in any other, to enable any one to perform it well. I leave it to others to improve upon myself. I have made it my plan to have no point to carry, and to have no favorites.

There is no man for whom I have more respect

than General Washington: but I would take the opinion of a last-maker on the form of a boot before the wisest man's in the world. I would go to a physician, and not to General Washington, if I wanted advice concerning my health. I knew General Washington, and I think he had some esteem for me, if I may believe his words. When therefore I differ from him, it will not be thought by you that I do it from any private bent. I believe that in relation to a national university he has mistaken his ground. I have said so much on this point, because we ought to give reasons for differing from such a great man.

The territory proposed by General Washington as the site for a national university, was the District of Columbia; and the reason which he assigned for it was, that the students would derive benefit from being near the national government. He appears to have considered it desirable, that the site of the university should be in juxta position with the capital. This, having been placed nearly intermediate between the extremes of the country, might make the point convenient for students from different states: but in every other respect, I apprehend, that city would be as bad a place as could be chosen.

One great objection is the vice which attends a court. Our general government is already by some called the court; and there is danger that the influx of strangers will aid in corrupting our capital, as it has done in all cities which have been the habitations of courts. Every man who is sober and honest, and has visited Washington, will tell you already that it is a vicious place. I have been told by many, that

they thought it to be regretted that Philadelphia had not continued to be the seat of government, because at Washington are the grossest and most contemptible vices. Now wherever students are it has been found a difficult task entirely to prevent them from gambling. What then would be the difficulty if they were assembled at the capital, where the great men, even ambassadors, are in the habit of gambling, and where gambling extends through all classes, even the blacks? The inevitable consequence would be, that the youth also would gamble. Now every gambler wastes time; and no one who has not time can study.

In the second place. Profaneness is very common at Washington; and the evils which would follow the introduction of youth from all parts of the Union to society there, for the purpose of being influenced by it, while this prevails in it, are so evident that it is unnecessary to dwell upon the subject.

In the third place. Irreligion is prevalent in that city to an enormous extent. I do not here mean the breach of any particular law: but, what is more dangerous, of all laws together. Profane people, like drunkards, wish to justify themselves; and religion is naturally scouted by them. But irreligion, which consists in possessing no regard for God, and no care for eternity: this irreligion, which flows on in society in a smooth tide, when approved by general consent, is thought capable of accomplishing genteel people, and is attended with all that train of pleasing manners which you find in polished company. When you mingle with such people, you will find their manners exactly fitted to please: their words and actions present

only ideas designed to render them agreeable companions. But all that is of a moral nature is left out: and for any thing that is of real value you seek in vain. To be accustomed to such society must prove more injurious to you than the exhibition of gross vice; for when gross vice is presented to you, you feel as if temptation came with a blush on her face. It is the lubricous appearance of it that you are to dread: for by this it steals upon the heart, and captivates unresisted. The success of temptation when it thus succeeds is complete; and the result is ruin, as absolute as can exist. I know of no persons as strongly guarded against all appeals to conscience, to reputation, to the presence of God, as accomplished, unprincipled men. There are no people whose hearts are more like the nether millstone. I would much rather send my children to a state prison, and make them hear the language of crime, than allow them to mingle with such companions. The principles with which they present you are a dish, which, though a bad one, is so well dressed by a French cook, that no one will perceive its nature.

Expense perfectly fascinates young people; and what examples of expensive living and expensive amusements would be constantly before the eyes of the young at the seat of government. The youth, when involved in this influence, is in the state of a bird charmed by a snake. He draws nearer and nearer, and at last is swallowed up. Expensive habits are always attended with idleness. Those who are expensive in this college are always idle. It is a great evil here among us; but how much greater would be its

extent and its injurious effects in a scene so much more favorable.

In the fourth place. It is proposed, by placing youths in an university at the seat of government, to make them all of the same political sentiments, but the political effect would on the contrary be rather injurious than beneficial. What is the result of the opinions expressed at Washington on youth who hear of them from a distance? Does the reading of the debates in Congress change your opinions? Is it a fact that many converts are made here by the arguments used at the seat of government? I do not believe there have been ten while I have been here. Our opinions are formed beforehand, our feelings become excited by reading the discussions, and the young especially are generally not in a state of mind for dispassionate reasoning. But go to that ground, where every other mind is excited to a still higher pitch, and you will find how much stronger your own feelings will become, and how much more distant you will be from yielding any thing to an opposite side. You will hear the deliberations there carried on by living and earnest orators. If there is eloquence displayed, you will be affected by it: your passions will become moved, you will feel warmed like those around you. But will you become partizans of the truth? Is it a fact that parties are more united at Washington than elsewhere? Will you not become more alienated from each other, from the fact that others are more alienated around you?

In the fifth place. Although it has been asserted that a national university would give us an uniform pronunciation of our language, I think there is no reason to

believe that this would be the result. In England there are two national universities: and I have no evidence that the pronunciation in them is the same. Their influence on that of the counties has certainly been small if any thing. You could not understand the dialects spoken in several parts of England. I have seen a play written in that of the West Country people, and a collection of poems in the Yorkshire dialect; and I could not discover the meaning. Now I understand you. There is no difference in the pronunciation of the various states to which you belong, except that of the letter *U*, which is sounded differently in some parts of our country. It is a pity that such a variation should be any where made: for the mode now becoming fashionable to some extent, is an anomaly in our language. I well remember when the old-fashioned people used to say *dare crechur* for *dear creature*, pronouncing the *U* in the same manner. This is a harsh anomaly, and it is remarked by a writer of respectability that it will not gain ground in England. It has however already gone further than the dial of Ahaz went backward.

Such being the state of things in England, and the influence exercised by the national universities of that country on the pronunciation of the language being so small, we have fallen upon better means in this country for the establishment of an uniform system here.

In the sixth place. It is said that in a national university the students would form attachments to each other, which would in some degree be felt in different states. I should hope they would form friendships, at least some of them: but I do not think this object would

be better gained than by the education of them in several distinct universities. The age at which it is proposed to bring them together is not the tender period of college life: they are to finish their education at the national university by spending three years there after having gone through a college. This more advanced age is not quite so favorable as the other for the formation of a warm friendship.

In the seventh place. It is stated that the instructors for so great an university would be more able than those of our colleges, as learned men might be brought from Europe. I do not think very highly of European instructors: I have spoken of them heretofore, when the question of foreign immigration was before us. And this I do not say from any prejudice against them. I am willing to give foreigners all the credit they deserve: I am perfectly willing to say that Robert Hall is a better writer of sermons than myself; and I do not know why I should not be able to judge fairly of other men. I would no more trust to European genius, than to Jack-with-a-lantern to lead me away into a swamp.

With regard to the universities of England, you may have erroneous ideas concerning the importance of the instructions communicated in them. My own opinions were confirmed by that expressed by Mr. Wilberforce to Mr. Silliman. When informed of the course of studies pursued in this college, he said that it was not very different from that of a common university education at Oxford and Cambridge. Judge Ellsworth considered an exhibition which he attended at one of those universities, as not exhibiting merit superior to one of our own. Any difference which exists in the state of

learning in the institutions of the two countries, does not arise from the want of power in the United States to furnish good instructors or other means. In England students are admitted on higher terms than here; and yet they have not too much time on their hands, but little enough, if they will apply themselves to their studies. It is our intention here also to raise our terms by degrees, as soon as it can be effected. We now teach more science than they do at Oxford: perhaps not more than they do at Cambridge. We could give practical education here as well as it can be furnished any where, if the means were only furnished us. This is the only obstacle existing to the success of the colleges of the United States; and the expense which the establishment of a national university would demand, bestowed upon colleges, would be more than is necessary for the whole country.

As to the importation of foreign instructors, no foreigner would do better in this country than Dr. Witherspoon, who came from Scotland, and added the splendor of his name to Princeton College. Indeed you have no reason to believe that any other foreigner would be as useful as he was. If we were now to offer encouragement to Europeans to come over and take the government of a university, you would not get Doctor Witherspoons: they would not be Christians; but Edinburgh Reviewers—men who throw religion out of the world with one stroke. Such men would be ready to come, and we should have them among us as instructors. We should see them attacking religion: not in an open and manly manner, but in an indirect and cowardly one. They would not bring up their ob-

jections fairly, so that you might meet them and knock them down: but they would strive to accomplish their object by ridicule. There would be danger that such sentiments would be encouraged at our seat of government, for there is much irreligion there. And where would be our security, if an irreligious national university were once established? What an influence must it exert on the country, by propagating bad opinions! A vote was recently given by some member of one of the houses of Congress, for Thomas Paine, when they were choosing a chaplain: and where such contempt is expressed for religion, what care would be taken to preserve it? This is the last insult that could be cast upon the religion of the gospel; and remember, there is no morality but what grows out of that religion.

In the eighth place. With respect to large and expensive libraries, apparatus, &c. with which, it is supposed a national university would be liberally supplied, they are matters of mere moon-shine in relation to the education of the pupils. The students do not want the books of a large library: they are totally unable to read them. They are of great value, and highly important to every college: but not for the use of the pupils. They are for the benefit of learned men, who wish to consult them and have time to devote to their perusal. Instead of seven thousand volumes, we ought for this purpose to have seventy thousand.

Our present places of learning are capable of being extended as soon as the means shall be furnished. There might be more professors added to Yale College without difficulty. The plan on which it is founded admits of extension, and the same is true of our

other colleges. The only obstacle to it is that found in the dispositions of those who might render us assistance. It is the same which prevented an old Indian some years ago from making a bow for a Sophomore, who by means of a present had obtained from him a promise to give him one. After repeated requests, he at last gave him as a final answer, "I won't."

Some of the states of the Union have been liberal to learning, and deserve the credit of it. Connecticut and New-Jersey should take the lead, for they have colleges long established, for which they have done nothing.

If a National University were established, it would be inexpedient.

DISPUTE XXIX.

March 16th, 1814.

Question. *Has a man a right to expatriate himself?*

Remark 1st. The meaning of naturalization, when rightly understood, amounts to this: that the person expatriated derives from the law, during his residence in his adopted country, the powers and privileges which belong to natural-born citizens: but after his departure from that country, he is as much bound to his native land—he is as much an Englishman or a Frenchman—as he ever was. The moment a foreigner who has been naturalized in the United States steps out of our territory, that moment he ceases to be an American. We are Americans all the world over: he is not.

Remark 2d. If the citizen has a natural right to expatriate himself, what right has his country in any manner to meddle with the question? The country, under such circumstances, would have no business even to say that he is at liberty, or to authorize him to transfer his allegiance. Our constitution declares, that every citizen of every state in the Union is a citizen of every other state in the Union; and this is sufficient to show, that our countrymen never supposed they had a natural right to be citizens of every state, and never

claimed the principle which is now by some maintained.

Remark 3d. It is remarkable that those nations which have had no intercourse with Europeans, entertain the same views in relation to expatriation and allegiance as those received in Europe. After the Dutch had established themselves in Batavia, they formed a court for the settlement of such questions as might arise between them and other inhabitants of the island. A variety of cases were brought before that court for adjudication; but so many difficulties arose, that in a case between them and the Chinese, an appeal was made to the Emperor. It appeared, on examination, that the Dutch were in the right; and the Emperor's reply to them was: "You need not trouble yourselves—men who will throw off their natural attachments to their country, and desert it as these Chinese have done, are such miscreants that they may as well die as live."

DECISION.

The doctrine of personal expatriation was first introduced into this country as a topic of enquiry, during the Revolution, or soon after. It engaged the attention of some few individuals for a time, and became a subject of conversation in a very limited degree only, but was not brought up distinctly to view until citizen Genet appeared, who came to this country, and undertook to instruct and govern us. He commissioned several vessels, to cruise against the commerce of England and Spain, in the name of the French government, but our rulers inter-

fered, and took the proper measures to prevent them, and he was afterwards expelled from the service of France. He clamorously accused the government of this country of denying, by their refusal to recognize his commissions, the important principle of personal expatriation. He claimed that Americans might expatriate themselves, and, receiving citizenship as Frenchmen, lawfully engage in hostilities against the enemies of France. His doctrine was soon opposed by many arguments from different quarters, and he at length found himself so hardly pressed for the means of defence, that he was obliged to confess that he had entered the contest somewhat unprepared, and that it was many years since he had turned over the musty tomes of Puffendorf and Grotius.

Since that time, however, the principle has been practically introduced into this country, and acknowledged in our courts, where decisions have been given corresponding with the opinions of our present chief magistrate. The principle of expatriation has been adopted by the French government, under the plea that every thing is right which is convenient for France. Nations are always too much inclined to determine upon "what is convenient for France." A few months ago the National Intelligencer published a labored argument, to induce our people to seize upon the Floridas. The grounds on which the writer argues are of the same nature. He states that our country is naturally bounded by the ocean, the Mississippi river and the Gulf of Florida. This may be a very convenient doctrine for us: but where is its justice? I am aware that some men hold the opinion,

that nations need not be over scrupulous about justice in their measures, except in cases in which they may incur the danger of collision with each other or a war. This is an agreeable strain to use for those who may think it favorable to their interests: but it is not half so good an argument as that contained in Satan's speech to Eve, when he tempted her in Paradise. Fiat Justitia! The man who wrote the sentiments in that newspaper, would sweep away the distinction between wrong and right, as a maid sweeps cobwebs with her broom.

The social compact is appealed to as the foundation of the right of expatriation. I am not now going to give you my views in relation to the social compact: but I shall content myself for the present with taking on their own ground those who maintain the right of expatriation. If there be a compact existing, as is claimed, there must necessarily be two parties concerned in it, one of which promises to see protection and justice secured to the other, on condition that it receives support; while the second stipulates to afford that support on condition of enjoying protection in return. How happens it then, that one of these parties may dissever this compact? No jurist ever admitted the principle, that a compact of any kind may be broken by a single party. A promise endures longer than these heavens and this earth. Once made, and it is forever binding, unless mutually dissolved. There is no retreating from this principle. The promisor has bound himself by a chain of adamant. Nothing but an impossibility standing in the way of its performance, or an inconsistency with the law of God, can ever dissolve a promise, until

it is dissolved by both parties. It is in vain for a man to seek to shelter himself from blame in breaking a promise, under the plea that its performance is impossible, if he knew it to be so at the time when he contracted the engagement: he has but been guilty of grosser villany in making it.

But if we could surmount this wall of adamant, which rises to heaven, we should not be a whit the better. The point contended for is, that expatriation may prove beneficial to the individual; and that in such a case, he has a right to change his allegiance. But no right can be a right to do wrong. Neither can the claim to dissolve the compact lie only on one side. If the individual may expatriate himself whenever he will, the country may certainly exercise the corresponding right, viz. that of absolving herself from her obligations to protect the citizen. Suppose this course to be adopted, and the principle to be put in practice by the government: what becomes of the man? Suppose a subject or citizen has a suit in court, pending which the country expatriates him. What becomes of him? The country has put him out of her protection in order to get rid of him, and to prevent the decision of his case, in which she may be interested as well as himself. Or, suppose that a neighbor, for some motive or other, kills him: and the government refuses to seize or to punish the murderer. Suppose another case: a man goes from the United States to Martinico, where he accumulates property, and dies, or is killed for his money. His son applies to our government to demand his property: they refuse to interfere, alleging that they do not choose to recognize him as a citizen. The subject

who claims the right of self-expatriation, by exercising it may free himself from exposure of life and property in war; but the country, in turn, should be allowed to expatriate at will all such as she may choose, and to deprive them of their claims on her protection, for a period as long as they are permitted to place themselves out of allegiance to the country. Under these circumstances expatriated persons should expect of course to sacrifice all the property they might leave in their native country.

This is but one of the ways in which the principle of expatriation is calculated to produce injury, if carried into practice. Some persons received from Citizen Genet a commission to cruize against the Spanish. Suppose a commission to invade Florida had been taken, and acted under by inhabitants of Georgia. Spain no doubt will fight those who make war against her: the consequence is that Georgia is invaded by the Spaniards, who, among other measures for self-defence, invite the slaves to join them by offers of freedom. Such a proceeding Spain would consider justifiable; and if we admit the principle of expatriation, we must thus expose ourselves to be involved in war, by almost any individual, at any time. We might indeed perhaps be successful in such a case, and by violence repel the invader: but we should be in danger of new difficulties and new invasions; and if we and other nations were once to enter upon such a course, the world would soon be reduced to a sad condition. But see how the principle of expatriation, if allowed, would operate in another supposable case. A man might leave this country, become a privateersman and cruize against our ships.

He might have his correspondence, as Williams had, with his friends in this country, and be regularly informed of the vessels sailing hence for the West-Indies, with all the particulars relating to them, so that he might select such victims as he chose, plunder them and butcher their crews. Judge Ellsworth shut Williams up in prison, and thus served him as justly as it lay in his power to do, unless he had hung him.

But in many other cases would the principle of expatriation apply with ruinous influence. Think what circumstances would occur in a time of war if it were acted on. A country would be compelled to fight her own subjects both abroad and at home; and every insurgent and deserter might claim the rights of a foreign subject.

But it is sometimes said that men have a right to seek happiness where they will; and that nations have acknowledged this right, or relinquished their claim to the allegiance of their subjects, by allowing or encouraging emigration. But here I remark: 1st. Emigration is not expatriation; 2d. It is performed under the supposition that it is with the encouragement or consent of the government.

When a man is persecuted for his religion, I think he ought to leave his country. In my opinion persecution is a solvent of allegiance. It supposes also the consent of the government: for the government cannot be supposed to wish to retain the subject whom it persecutes.

It is possible for either the government or the citizen to forfeit his right by ill conduct. If a government forcibly expel a citizen, it does what it has no right to

do. Before some such step, no right exists in the citizen to expatriate himself: but out of it a right may grow.

The whole fabrick to which the pretended right of expatriation belongs, I regard as unfounded and visionary. Government is founded on the law of God. This I trust I shall hereafter prove to be true, and show you that the theory founded on the social compact is false. This point can be gained, by those who advocate the theory, only by going in the direction of a Virginia fence, while we are pretending to walk in a straight course.

DISPUTE XXX.

March 17th, 1814.

Question. *Is the study of the Dead Languages beneficial?*

Remark 1st. Every man has his own style of writing. When he translates from another language, he should not attempt to adopt the style of the original, but to take the author's meaning, and express it in his own style. The speeches introduced into this college as exercises for declamation, I could improve, I think, one half, merely by erasing such things as ought to be omitted. Be careful in translating not to force in every word you find in the Latin or Greek author. Many of them are unnecessary in English, and would only weaken the force of the translation.

Remark 2d. Milton has left us his Latin verse: it is good as Latin, and good as poetry. He wrote Greek verse somewhat; but has only left the fragment of a poem in that language.

Remark 3d. Translating Greek and Latin is not sufficient to correct some of the simplest habits of bad diction or style. It will not always cure hesitation in speech, or the habit of saying—*eh, eh, and—eh,* which I sometimes find among students. Any body, by proper attention, may learn to speak fast, and to use good

language. Some indeed find a difficulty in overcoming hesitation in speech: but I never saw a Frenchman who could not speak fast enough. You will often observe a great difference in the power of talking among a party of persons. Some will talk for a mile in length, without the least idea that they are not talking the most profound sense all the time. Speaking fluently and speaking with hesitation may be acquired. I mention this because it may be a matter of some importance to you to know how you can overcome a bad habit in speaking. I was once accustomed to speak with hesitation, and had difficulty in selecting my words: but I found it so inconvenient, that I determined to break through the habit at all events, and to speak on, good or bad. I soon found the benefit of this resolution; for having adhered to it in practice a short time, I experienced far less difficulty in conversing, and at length entirely overcame the bad habit I had insensibly fallen into. In this way you may obtain equal success, if you suffer the same difficulty. Persevere with determination, and you will infallibly get rid of the habit. Many youths find it embarrassing to hold a conversation of length in company; and it almost always requires practice for any one to rise and address a meeting of any kind. You may accustom yourselves to speaking extemporaneously, by making a first essay among such an assembly as will be least likely to embarrass you, and select a subject with which you are best acquainted. Choose if you can a topic which you have argued before: and under these circumstances you will be almost sure to succeed. Guard against a failure in the first experiment: for if you

fail once, you will be likely to fail again. Dr. Dana of this town has never practised extemporaneous speaking; and he has given as a reason for it, that he was unsuccessful in his first attempt, and never made a second. It is of importance to become possessed of the power of extemporaneous speaking, and you should try to acquire it, both for public and private occasions. You never had any difficulty in expressing yourselves in the presence of other persons when you were children, and you have it not now at the fire-side.

Remark 4th. Where there is a substantive following another, the former being in the singular number and the other in the plural, there are more transgressions of plain grammar than in any other case.

DECISION.

The study of the dead languages is, in my view, an important branch of a liberal education; and I would have it pursued with faithfulness. I am of opinion, however, that a change should be made in regard to the age at which this branch of instruction should be communicated. I would have the languages taught at a very early age; and for the following reasons.

There is a period in human life, which, whatever be the system of education adopted for it, I have observed, is worth little. This period embraces several of the years of childhood and youth, during which parents send their sons and daughters to school because they are too young to work, and so troublesome as to disturb their employments at home. They send them to the care of a schoolmistress or schoolmaster, that they may be out of harm's way. In this long period

they get a knowledge of reading, writing, spelling, and a little arithmetic; but, with this exception, their time is lost, and often worse than lost. These years, thus spent, are, it is true, not quite fruitless; but it does not follow that they are as profitably spent as they might be. Children are capable of learning doctrines, words, facts and men, and a number of arithmetical truths. In arithmetic the ideas are so distinct, and the definitions so well stated, that children will learn more in this science than in any other. God has also fitted them to learn a few important truths of a religious nature. Generally speaking, they learn words and facts with the greatest facility. I will give you an example, to prove the aptitude of the infantile mind for the acquisition of words.

Dr. Marshman has distinguished himself by the facility with which he learns languages. When he began the study of the Chinese, he undertook it in company with two of his sons. They in a short time far outran their father, who has outrun most men. This is a perfectly decisive case.

Now I suppose that God has formed the mind in such a manner, that in childhood it is better capable of acquiring particular kinds of knowledge than at other periods of life. I am therefore in favor of communicating different branches at such times as Providence seems to have pointed out for them. I have supposed it to be wise to teach children words and facts, especially facts of a religious nature; for those who have made the experiment must have found, that they take a peculiar interest in the great doctrines of religion, the narratives of the Scriptures, &c. and they show such a

capacity for comprehending, and such a power of applying them, that it seems as if their minds had been made expressly for the purpose. In teaching a child a religious doctrine, however, care should be taken to present it in its simple form, that it may not come up in a partial or unnatural manner, so as to produce perplexity in the mind, which would impair the course of instruction, and do more harm than good. I would urge the subject of early religious instruction very seriously, and press the importance of communicating this interesting and indispensable branch of education, at a tender period of life. If we neglect it, we lose the benefit of the constitution God has given us.

With the dead languages also I would begin early. I advise you to send children to study Greek and Latin at eight years of age, and to let them study them till fourteen. Some children may begin earlier, some should begin later: but the time I have set will form the basis of a good general rule. I have taught many little children, and have had such experience that I know pretty well the state of their minds. I think very little of theory in this case, and would conduct in relation to it under the dictates of experience, and nothing else. I am better pleased with Mr. Locke's mode of teaching languages than any other I have ever met with, or that has been adopted. Children learn words best and most easily by hearing them spoken; and I think this would be the most excellent way for teaching Latin and Greek. By adopting this method, those languages, I think, would be obtained at an earlier age than they now are. I would not take more books, but

while I used them, I would speak in those languages to the children, so that they should learn them as they do their mother tongue.

There are many other things which might be taught to children in a similar way, and which are never taught them. I can take a child, and teach it to write very well, in one half the time which is commonly employed for that purpose. I should however pursue a different course from that commonly practised. The child should write but half of each forenoon and afternoon, instead of being engaged steadily, three hours at a time. The pupil necessarily becomes weary when confined too long at such an employment; and then there is no more improvement. The time spent after this he loses. Take a child who has been used to writing in this manner until thirteen or fourteen years of age, and appropriate only an hour and a half at one time for him to write, and then, by pursuing this course, which may be improved in other respects also, you will find that he will learn more in a short time than in all the previous years. His progress will often be greater even than it would have been on the old plan, including both periods. There is no advantage, but there is rather injury, in beginning to write too young. Children are too lively, and their fingers are too weak and too short to manage a pen. Writing is capable of being taught scientifically, on geometrical principles; and I can do it all within the compass of half an hour. To spend seven years, then, in learning to write in the common way, is to spend it in a worthless manner.

A child must be taught to spell before he is taught to read. He must learn to know every combination of letters at the glance of the eye. How different in all respects from what I recommend, is the plan commonly pursued! It is all little-end-foremost, so far as I have observed our schools; and the influence of the present system is very much to be lamented. If some of the most unquestionable and reasonable improvements were introduced, they would procure great advantages. But half the time now employed would be required, and the child would be much better taught. But can it be necessary to devote as much as one half the time between seven and fourteen years of age to teaching to read and write? No. But some use must be made of the time; and what would not be required for this purpose, I would fill up with some other profitable branches of instruction. I would teach words and facts: religious, historical, geographical, &c. But it is not sufficient to say merely that much time is now lost: it is often worse than lost. For during this long attendance at school, while the child makes for a long time little or no progress, bad habits are imbibed which are not afterwards gotten rid of: particularly dismal habits of reading, which go to the grave with him.

I would employ the child at writing so long as it is really a pleasure, which is as long as he derives any benefit from the exercise. I would then put him to arithmetic, the learning of words and of facts, as long as each of these in turn is pleasant, and, by frequent changes, occupy, and agreeably occupy the time. I have seen the operation of different plans of study so long, and have had such an acquaintance with minds,

that I assert all love facts. Put geography, history, travels, novels, plays, and every other species of books in common use in early life together, and then enquire, and you will find that facts are the basis on which we erect the whole amount of our knowledge. Such being the case, we should store the youthful mind with useful materials; and, by pursuing the plan I have recommended, there would be no danger of disappointing any other valuable purpose. I believe a child might be well versed in the facts that constitute the general history of the church, his own country, Greece, England, Rome, and other countries still, and at the same time be considerably acquainted with the Roman and Grecian languages. But the fault is with the parents: they will not pay for schoolmasters. They will incur more expense to teach a young lady to embroider "a piece," as it is called, which is to be hung up, to paint "a piece," and to play a few tunes, than it would cost to make her wise, and her brother too. I will not undertake to say whether these acquirements are not better than wisdom: but wisdom is still of a certain degree of value.

I have made these remarks that you may know how to go to work, when the instruction of the young shall be committed to you. I return to the subject in dispute, to show you why I approve of the study of the dead languages.

First. The attainment of the languages is a very pleasant introduction to other studies. We are naturally opposed to work. The mind is opposed to it even more than the body; and that is enough. Arithmetic is a good preamble to education: but do not give chil-

dren so much of it as to weary or to discourage them. Weariness and discouragement are the great evils in a system of education to be avoided. The powers of the young mind must be tried: not so as to discourage it, but so as to strengthen it; and the languages are better fitted for this purpose than any thing else. Arithmetic will do much, but not all. The habit of study, which is acquired by turning over the dictionary in search of the meanings of words, by applying the rules, &c. is valuable enough to compensate for all the labor which would be lost by the student, even if he were afterwards to throw his books away.

Words occupy the mind more than facts do, until we have committed them to memory, and are able to employ them usefully. If I had the direction of the matter, I would make the youth know how to read Latin as well as English before he came to college. This should be taught at academies as English is at school; and I hope we shall attain this advantage at no great distance of time. How gratifying must such a plan of instruction appear to the pupil! The words he learns he applies to objects around him, and employs in conversation; so that, instead of acquiring rules without any apparent object, his mind understands the use of every step it takes.

The *second* advantage of studying the dead languages is, that they open to us a very useful field of information. A large proportion of the ancient books written in Greek and Latin have no translations, and they contain most of the learning which is in the world. The Latinist, in the course of reading and conversation, has also the benefit of being able to open to him-

self a numberless amount of Latin quotations and allusions, besides having the authors in that language at his command. You will find professed quotations from authors, of the correctness of which you will not be satisfied; and how important is it to be able to satisfy yourself by examining the originals! Dr. Priestly, in his controversy with Bishop Horsley, made translations from Epiphanius, in some passages of which he suppressed important parts of the original, under the plea that he was unwilling to burthen his readers with long extracts; and it was only by a reference to the original that his attempted imposture was exposed. When the passages were taken entire, it was sometimes found that the middle, which he had omitted, would contradict the two extremes. Gibbon is charged by Dawes, with having deceived in his quotations in fifty-six instances. Gibbon took no notice of any of these except four.

In the third place, the Latinist obtains much advantage from the fact, that English is derived from Greek and Latin. Greek constitutes a great part of our technical language, which is a vast field of information, to which we get access through the study of that tongue, and more cheaply, more satisfactorily, and more easily, than we could in any other way.

Again: the knowledge of the ancient languages opens to you access to writers who have formed standards of taste. To fix a standard of taste is a work of very great importance, and so important, in my view, that I will give you my opinion somewhat at length on the subject. Sound taste, sound sense, and sound morals go together: this is the law of the universe. Of what great importance therefore it is, that the stan-

dard fixed should be a good one: for when a good standard is once established, you can bring all writers to it, and approve or condemn and control them according to just rules. It is of great moment then to know the different standards of different times and countries, that we may appreciate the excellencies and deficiencies of each, and learn by what steps they have been formed, overthrown, or superceded.

CONCLUSION OF THE DECISION, P. M.

I was speaking of the ancients as furnishing standards of taste. I remarked that sound taste, sound sense, and sound morals always go together. I do not imagine that this fact will strike you as strongly, or appear to you as important, as it does to me, but I advise you to consider it hereafter: keep the subject in mind, observe every evidence which presents itself relating to its truth and its importance, and form your own opinions, without depending on what I have now told you without evidence. The best mode to pursue in this examination I will recommend to you. Look through the ages of Christianity and Heathenism, look through the countries where Heathenism and Christianity have prevailed, and look through the lands in which the Jews lived. Mark the sense and the morality which distinguished each; and you will find that the periods when the people were purest, were those in which the national taste was best. The decline of taste is generally perceptible in individual writers; and every violation of a good national taste, in my apprehension, makes the man worse. During the times of Isaiah and Jeremiah, the national taste of the

Hebrews was still pretty good, though on the decline; but after their death it fell, and then morality fell with it. So the Greeks and the Romans dropped their taste, such as it was, when their religion declined. In Great-Britain, at the present time, with the revival of religion, taste has risen. When I was a youth, taste was going down hill in that country with great rapidity, and Gibbon helped it in its descent. But you can find no man to write now as he wrote, for he had still a portion of the national taste which he assisted to impair. You will see no spangles on poetry such as he put upon it.

When I was much younger, there was said to be a vast quantity of light breaking in upon us: Godwin and Tom Paine were bringing it in, and we were to have an abundance. Every thing old was so much scouted, that any one could challenge Christians to demonstrate "geometrically" their religion to be true, if filled with the spirit of these sentiments. The light which was boasted of, however, was much like the light which an author tells us of, "caused by certain tenebrificous stars, which shot out darkness, as other stars shoot out light:" a wonderful discovery! Amidst corrupt sentiments, great deviations from correct taste will get into circulation and obtain currency. Many bad men, it is true, have had good taste; but they have generally been the best among the bad.

The Greeks regarded nature in their writings: so did the Romans. The Europeans have copied them but the Asiatics have not. It becomes us before we fix our standard, to recover all the standards of the ancients: we cannot make a new one. We have standards of style in our own language; and those of

a high rank. The time will come when Milton and Addison will hold the place of Homer and Virgil. This will be assigned them by the testimony of ages.

The standard of our taste, therefore, should be high, considering the importance of the subject, and the means we have for its elevation. The advantages of studying the dead languages I have enumerated as follows:

1st. The advantages which professional men derive from them.

2d. The grammatical knowledge they give us of our own tongue. Our language is heterogeneous and anomalous: the Latin and Greek are analogical. Their origin was principally from one source: ours is derived from the Saxon, French, Celtic, Hebrew and other languages, beside the Greek and Latin. Though many of these, in relation to our tongue, are large rivers, and others but small rills, yet they mix and form the whole, which is of course very anomalous. I remember but one man, who was a good grammarian in English, and who did not understand the Latin language: that was Roger Sherman. His knowledge of grammar under this disadvantage was owing to the greatness of his mind.

Those who study our language without being acquainted with Latin or Greek may be good grammarians as far as they go, but they do not go far enough. Those two languages give us grammar in a form nearly as perfect as we can ever expect to see it. In the grammar of the Latin or the Greek, we have a language reducible to rules, the rules given, and the reasons for them shown.

The Greek seems to be the most perfect language we have, and the study of it gives us a view of what a perfect language is. This may be compared with the study of mathematics, in which the standard is perfect, and every thing is measured by a right and unerring rule. In Greek, although the rules are not without exceptions, those exceptions are presented as deviations, and of the rules we never lose sight. As these rules are founded on intelligible principles, such as our reason approves, we have before us a language of perfect reasoning, although the perfection does not extend to every point it contains.

4th. The knowledge of a language gives you a knowledge of the nations who spoke it. I shall not enter into an examination of this point at present, having heretofore given you my views of it to some extent in your recitations on Duncan and Locke: but, to enable you to determine fairly on a question like that now before us, it is proper that every important point be touched.

5th. By acquiring these languages you obtain a much greater knowledge of thought. Thought is changed and varied endlessly, by minds and circumstances. The thoughts of a Roman writer were not the same with those which are derived by an Englishman, from reading a translation of his works. A multitude of instances might be cited to show how changes in circumstances and habits of life, customs, religion, &c., &c., have often given to words an import which they did not originally possess.

In the New Testament we read of a sick man being let down from the top of a house, to be placed at

the feet of the Saviour, when he was surrounded by a crowd, because access could not be obtained to the place where he stood in any other manner. When an unlearned person reads this passage, he forms an idea of a house, but not of such an house as that in which this event occured. The dwellings in Palestine were constructed with open squares or courts in the middle, and with flat roofs, to which the inhabitants often retreated for the enjoyment of the air. Now, instead of removing a part of the roof to let the sick man through, which a common reader might suppose must have been done, his friends had only to lower him down from the level house-top, which might have been easily effected; and this description, which clears up at once, in the most satisfactory manner, all the seeming inconsistency in the account referred to, is but a fair example of many other cases in ancient writers, which require and are susceptible of the most ample explanation.

We read in another place that Christ's coat was woven without seam. A word is here used to express the garment he wore, which we call a coat. To an Englishman it would appear very inconceivable, that it should be woven without a single seam: but it is very plainly possible and easy to do it, when we know the form of the garment intended. On the habits and customs of the Israelites, you will find a great deal of interesting matter in the third and fourth volumes of Calmet's Fragments, and many advantages of this nature are to be derived from an acquaintance with the languages.

6th. I remark that the study of the languages has cherished or produced a strong attachment to what is

called eloquence in the large sense: good writing and good speaking. The power of eloquence is not the result of the study of science only. I will tell you how the subject strikes my mind. You will observe that where languages are chiefly cultivated, the arts and graces are cherished; and the contrary takes place where science occupies the chief place, and the ancient tongues are neglected. Among the Greeks and Romans great attention was paid to writing well, in their acceptation of the term: that is, they devoted great pains to the production of effect by their writings and speeches. They were very desirous of making impressions, though they had often too little regard to the truth or justice of a case. And in this they succeeded. In their courts, for example, they addressed the feelings of the judges, by bringing in criminals with ashes on their heads, to excite commiseration; and sometimes also, widows and orphans of persons who had suffered death, were exhibited to excite feelings against the murderers. With us such resorts are not allowed. We go to statutes and laws. These determine the case, and not those circumstances which are calculated only to arouse the passions.

I think that science is on the whole of greater worth than languages: but the latter also have their value. In using the word science here, I intend to apply it in the popular sense, in which it embraces the branches of natural history, law, medicine, &c., as well as the purely intellectual departments. I advocate also the study of all these, although neither chemistry, nor mineralogy, nor natural philosophy is to be carried into your common current business. I am in

favor of the languages combined with the other branches of knowledge, because mankind are creatures not merely of judgment, but of feeling also. This fact is universal and important; and things have been wisely instituted.

The general tenor of the students of this college is to neglect rhetoric: yet, for writers of good sense they may be fairly pitted against any equal number of youths I have seen. The languages have been proved here to be an useful branch of study, though not the only useful one. From reading the ancient authors, the youth catches their fire, and receives more and more of it the farther he proceeds. The faculty of speaking and writing well is of much value, and worthy of great attention; and it is important that we understand by what course of study it is to be attained. The cultivation of taste in language is undoubtedly a very necessary part of education: and while I believe that the study of the sciences has a tendency to make great men, I believe also that the study of the languages has a tendency to make men eloquent. I would not compare the advantages of these two branches separately considered. I have no disposition to idolize the ancients: but if the advantages to which I have referred, belong to the languages, let the fact that they belong to them be fully admitted.

But we must at the same time view every thing else relating to the ancients with equal impartiality. Their religion was foolish; their chemistry, astronomy, and natural philosophy, were a set of dry, feeble efforts. The politics of the present age, our religion, our morals, are incomparably better. Our natural phi-

losophy is as superior to their system, as the accents of an orator to the lispings of a child.

With regard to the arts, we are not on the whole behind them. In architecture, painting, sculpture, &c. they excelled us. In other arts they were inferior; and taking the arts all together, we are much more advanced than they were. They had not the study of foreign languages to go through in their course of education, but they applied themselves to their own tongue to acquire excellence in eloquence; for the heavy, though profound speeches of those who study only intellectual branches, would not have moved their popular assemblies. Neither is the mere accumulation of knowledge of any kind at the present day the only proper object of education: the faculty of communicating it, is of indispensable importance. It is of the utmost consequence to operate upon mankind; but every person has not the power of doing it, for want of proper preparation. Various obstacles interpose themselves, in different cases, to prevent the effect of addresses from those not trained to the art of eloquence. For example, I wish to operate upon my friends, by agreeable or instructive conversation, in a chimney-corner; but if I am ill-timed, or tedious, I had better let it alone.

Whatever other acquisitions may have been made, the youth who has not acquired the art of eloquence, will, for many occasions, have thrown away his talent.

The sciences however ought not to be forgotten or neglected. They are necessary to us in education, because they accustom us to think, and train us to

thinking in the best manner. But here they stop. They rather chill than cultivate the imagination, and they do not address themselves to any of the feelings, like the study of the languages. The love of country, the *amor patriæ*, that attachment to one's own land, its inhabitants, and their good, which ought to prevail in the heart of every man, should be carefully cherished; and I know of no mode in which it has been so well sustained in education, as by the study of the languages.

Add together all these advantages which belong to this branch of education, and I think you will see that it has more to recommend it than is commonly supposed in this college. If the views which I have given yesterday and to-day upon the subject be just, I think you will be convinced that the study of dead languages is beneficial. If not, I would have you determine the question for yourselves.

DISPUTE XXXI.

March 22d, 1814.

Question. *Ought the Judiciary to be independent?*

DECISION.

If Judges are dependent, they must be dependent either for their places or for their salaries. To inquire whether they should be dependent or not, leads us to enquire what they have to do. When we have considered what their province is, we shall be able to see by what means they may become useful, and by what they may prove injurious.

1st. To pronounce on the constitutionality of the laws, is one of the duties of a judge. You may ordinarily suppose, that, in a time of peace and quietness, our laws will be constitutionally formed: but we can easily suppose congress rash enough in some cases to pass unconstitutional laws; and these might produce extensive injury. In some instances it may be found a difficult matter clearly to understand or to show the meaning of our constitution; and in attempting it errors may be committed. Besides, frequent alterations of it are made, or proposed; and if this practice should continue, it may become something like the clergyman's wig, which was described as being like nothing

else in the universe. It is changed so often, that it is likely to be changed into something of a different nature.

2d. Another duty of the judges is to interpret the laws. This power is exclusively their own. The legislature make the laws, but is not allowed to interpret them when they have been made.

3d. The judges always pronounce the sentence of the law. Here remark that the judges bring the law home to the fireside, to the family, to the man. This is a duty not within the province of the legislator. It requires integrity, as well as wisdom, in the highest degree. A good judge cannot avoid pronouncing the penalties of the laws upon offenders, nor can he refuse to execute the bad laws; but bad laws will come through his hands in the most gentle way.

4th. Another duty of the judge is, to expound the law. If a law be unwisely framed, he will have wisdom enough to point out its evil tendency, and to show its defects.

Now in the discharge of these several important duties, a judge may act under a bad influence. It is evident that judges may do much good and much harm by performing their tasks well or ill: and when you reflect on this you will see the necessity of their acting independently.

Let us now enquire on whom may judges be dependent. When Judge Marshall pronounced sentence in favor of Colonel Burr, after his trial, Mr. Jefferson expressed an opinion in favor of rendering the judiciary dependent, and hoped to persuade the people to sanction such a measure. But how injurious would have been

such a change! Judge ——— has shown in a striking manner, and by sound reasoning, that there is no government in the world more dangerous than one consisting of two branches; and, if our judiciary should be rendered dependent on the Legislative or Executive branch, we should have but two branches left us. Let us see how things would operate, if the judges were dependent on the legislature.

Every house of legislature is generally governed by one, two, three or more prominent men on each side, whom the rest cannot resist. Those of the majority have a point they wish to carry, and pass a law. The judge pronounces it unconstitutional; and they tell him they shall dispose of him. He draws with him a train of their opponents, and a contest soon grows out of it, which may incline the bench from side to side with the changing power of the parties.

It is said that some check is necessary for a judge, to keep him upright. You may safely adopt this opinion: that it is better to have one tyrant than a hundred. The one may demand from you two-thirds of all you possess: the hundred will pick you to the bone. I have seen wicked men placed in houses of legislation, and observed their conduct. I have seen office-covetors sacrifice their honesty: office-seekers are usually dishonest men.

We are to depend on our judges. They are liable to odium if just and virtuous men, because they will displease the bad; but if they are beyond their reach, they will not be prevented from performing their duty.

If they are dependent on the Executive, they will be afraid of him, because they may be deprived of their

salaries for deciding against his wishes. Even if a judge have sufficient property for his support, and is in no danger of starving by being deprived of his salary, he has a character; and to be hurled out of office is considered as disgraceful. But suppose, that after being deprived of the office he continues to be respected, and enjoys prosperity in life, what will his successor do? Will he risk his reputation and property, to maintain the principles for which the former was removed, and stand ready to be displaced in his turn whenever the case may demand it? Will he unnecessarily incur the hazard of being thrown out by the Executive like a tennis ball? No: if he accepts the office, it will not be until he has his conscience seared. If you have judges turned out of office for discharging their duty, your second set will be dishonest; and your third will be worse yet. I want to see on the benches such judges as nothing in the universe will shake.

The universal doctrine on this subject is, to take away temptation from men to abuse the office of judges. You will get good judges if they are to remain in office for life.

But in reply to these arguments it is said, that the judges of the state of Connecticut are dependent. This I lament: it is the weak spot in the constitution: it is the heel of Achilles; it is the vulnerable point—and I fear we are wounded there sometimes. There is however much stability in our offices in this state. In Vermont it is totally different: the judges there are in fact entirely dependent, and a change in the judiciary must soon be made.

The press in this country fought many a battle to

obtain the independence of the judiciary; and in my opinion it never acted so wisely. I would have a judge fear nothing but God: to every thing else his face should be iron and brass. So important and difficult is the office of judge, that the first man in the community ought to hold it.

DISPUTE XXXII.

March 23d, 1814.

Question. *Do Spectres appear?*

Remark. That what is immaterial cannot reflect light is nothing, as an objection to the appearance of spectres. Angels are seen. If God is to make spectres apparent to us, they must send light to our eyes. It is contrary to our experience that immaterial objects are visible: but not beyond the power of God to make them so. If a spectre is to appear, I apprehend God can make it appear. We are to argue concerning facts, and not concerning the possibility of the thing, for the appearance of spectres is supposed to be against the laws of nature.

DECISION.

It is somewhat remarkable that the appearance of spectres has been in most nations and through most ages, the object of supreme belief, and through other ages, with some men, an object of supreme contempt. It is very commonly asserted, that the testimony in favour of their appearance is not sufficient; that they have appeared only to men in humble life; that they appear only to one person and in the night; that the

motives often are trivial; that there never has been an instance in which the evidence of such appearances was satisfactory; that many supposed cases of their appearance have been proved to be mistakes; that where they have been doubted, tales of them have ceased; and, on the contrary, where they have been believed in, they have multiplied.

On the other side it has been said, there is no more reason to disbelieve the appearance of spectres *a priori* than any other fact. Angels and evil spirits visit this world, then why may not the spirits of departed men? The angel who appeared to St. John in the Apocalypse said: "I am of thy brethren the prophets." Perhaps he was a Saint, and intended to be so understood. Samuel appeared to Saul; and other cases might be mentioned in which departed spirits have returned to the earth, and visibly appeared to men. It is not necessary that the errand on which a spirit may be sent, should be immediately of great consequence to men: it may prove so afterwards. Some of the objections to the appearance of spectres above mentioned have been replied to in the course of the discussion: as for instance, it has been said with truth, that spectres have sometimes been reported to be seen by day light, by several witnesses at once, and under circumstances favorable to the detection of imposture.

The story told by Dr. Smith has already been alluded to. He states that he was once engaged in the settlement of a large estate in England, and found that a highly important document was missing, which was absolutely necessary to prove the title. As a very interesting family were dependent in the decision of

the case for their livelihood, his feelings were greatly excited on the subject. The time rapidly approached when the cause was to be tried; and as he was sitting alone in his study one day, a stranger presented himself, in a neat black dress, without any thing very extraordinary in his appearance, whose approach was attended by no noise, and of whose appearance he was not aware until he raised his eyes by accident. Although he was surprised to find a person thus unceremoniously introduced into his private study, he had at first no suspicion of his being a supernatural visiter. The stranger after a courteous salutation, informed him that he knew he was anxiously wishing to obtain an important document, and that it was to be found in the possession of a nobleman whom he mentioned, and to whom he recommended to him to make application. After communicating this information the mysterious visiter disappeared, it was difficult to imagine how; for he was not yet suspected of being a spectre, and, on enquiry being made, none of the family had seen such a person, either entering or retiring. The Doctor appears to have been a man of strong mind, neither weak nor superstitious. He deliberated much and coolly upon this singular occurrence, but felt a great unwillingness to apply to the nobleman in question, on what appeared such unsatisfactory ground, and such an errand, and at last made up his mind to take no notice of the matter. He however was again visited by the same person, under very similar circumstances, being again surprised in his study by his unexpected appearance, and being once more urged, with more persuasion to apply to the nobleman and request him

to search for the paper. He at length became convinced that the experiment was worth trying, he visited the nobleman and obtained what he desired. The document proved of the utmost importance, and saved the estate to the rightful heirs. The Doctor afterwards collected all the facts relating to the stranger's appearance, and makes out a very strong claim of evidence in favour of his being a spectre. The story does not sound like a common one: the narrator was a man of good character and wit. He possessed an ardent mind, and strong prejudices, but had strength of intellect and was one of the first English preachers.

The circumstances of this case were peculiar, and several of the natural objections to common ghost stories will not lie against it. The spectre is represented to have come into the Doctor's room in the day time; there was nothing that would seem likely to favor imposture or mistake; the veracity of the narrator cannot be questioned; and the proof of the whole seems to have been furnished by the finding of the document sought for. Perhaps this story is in all respects as unexceptionable as any that has ever been furnished to prove the appearance of spectres.

I will mention another. The authority on which it rests I consider good: the man who furnished the evidence was not a learned man, but was of unquestionable veracity, and remarkable for his moderation. He was a respectable inhabitant of this town some years ago, with whom I was acquainted. At the age of sixteen, and while an apprentice to his father, who was a blacksmith, he was proceeding from a friend's to his father's house at about two o'clock at night, when he

saw a person walking at no great distance before him. He took him for a fellow apprentice, with whom he was on terms of intimacy and warm friendship, and walked fast to overtake him, making as little noise as possible, intending to take him by surprise. They were but a little distance from the old burying ground on the Green as he drew near, and the course taken by the young man was by one of the paths leading into it. He soon overtook him, and suddenly extending his arms endeavored to clasp him round the body: but to his surprise, he did not arrest his progress, nor appear to attract his notice, nor was he sensible of feeling any thing in his grasp. Still he was not at all alarmed, but felt so confident that the young man was his friend, that he continued to pursue him, until he proceeded to a spot in the burying-ground, where he stopped and speedily vanished. He thought the occurrence so extraordinary, that he determined to mark the spot, and gathering a few bones, brush and stones together, made a little heap, and proceeded homeward. He went to his room, and retired to bed; after which he learnt from some of the family that his fellow apprentice was sick. His disease which was the pleurisy, soon terminated his life. When the sexton went to the grave-yard, some of the friends, who accompanied him to determine the spot where the grave should be made, without any knowledge of the story of the apparition, chose the place where it had disappeared; so that the first thing the sexton did was to clear away with his spade the little heap by which it had been distinguished. These details I received from a

gentleman who had them from the surviving apprentice. I might have heard the story from him also, as he lived for sometime afterwards, and I attended at his last sickness and prayed with him: but I never asked him any questions on the subject. The evidence was strong that he told the truth; and there was nothing that I know of to contradict it. It is true that the time was night: but the moon was bright, and objects at a short distance were almost as distinctly visible as by day. There was indeed no important end to be accomplished by the apparition, so far as we can see, unless that of producing useful impressions on the mind of the young man. This is also liable to another common objection; viz. that there was but one witness of the supposed spectre.

I remark of the belief in spectres, that it prevails among ignorant people. This I might attribute in all cases to the influence of fear overcoming a weak intellect: but persons of intelligence and judgment have also been found among the number. A man of this character, a friend of mine, firmly believed that his wife used to come for five or six weeks after her death, and sit by his bed-side and converse with him. He spoke of her visits, and at length mentioned that she informed him she should not appear again: which he afterwards declared was the fact. He was not inclined to superstition, but firmly maintained the truth of this story. The conversations he had held with the apparition were distinctly remembered by him, and frequently spoken of. They related to matters important to the family, particularly the manage-

ment of the children. Here was a strong conviction of the appearance of a spirit, but with no fear, no superstition, no weakness of mind.

But it is true, as is often remarked, that supposed spectres are generally seen but by solitary persons, in the night and in lonely places; and that many tales of apparitions have been proved to be totally false. The witches which once made so much noise in New-England, and were so extensively believed in, have all been explained, and the stories which then passed for truth, are universally rejected. Such changes in opinions sometimes take place. Dr. Cotton Mather, a very great man, but with some whims, wrote a book to prove that a denial of the appearance of spectres was an approval of the doctrine of the Sadducees. The course of reasoning in this work was very weak. Such however was the general opinion at the time, that the power of witches and the interference of spirits in the affairs of men were seriously believed, and the Superior Court of Massachusetts in many cases punished capitally persons convicted of witchcraft. Now this was an extraordinary case in history. In almost all countries capital laws have existed against witchcraft. In England there have been many cases in which executions have taken place. It may seem strange that a court like that of Massachusetts could have proceeded to such a length in circumstances of the kind: but they proceeded on the ground that spectral sights afforded legal testimony: and this being once admitted, convictions and sentences necessarily followed. Still many sentences were probably entirely unjustifiable. Judge Sewall, who was con-

cerned in condemning those who suffered death, afterwards became so strongly convinced of having done wrong, that he made a yearly confession before the church. A magistrate in Northampton received a complaint from one inhabitant against another for bewitching him, and had him whipped ten stripes, saying it was justice if not law. Now numerous reports of this kind, however false, no doubt passed as true, because public opinion was favorable to them, and no evidence against them was brought to light. I am therefore ready to believe, that other stories, equally destitute of foundation, may gain credence in societies predisposed to believe them, and may present themselves in a respectable aspect to the world, being presumed to be supported by evidence.

The mind, it is well known, may be so affected by disease as to receive strange and false conceptions. A lady of this town, of very amiable character and much respected, some years since exhibited a case of this kind. Her husband had a controversy with a man, from which she appears to have apprehended some unhappy result: for hearing a knocking at the door one day, and seeing her husband leave the room, she fancied that his enemy had come to do him some injury. Her agitation threw her into a fit of hysterics, during which she was heard by her friends to speak as if to two men fighting in her presence, and showed symptoms of wildness and terror. The occasion which gave rise to her alarm was of some trivial nature, in no way connected with what she fancied; so that the effects on herself were caused by her fears. Cases of this kind are by no means uncommon, and we readily

admit that such effects may be easily produced by an excited imagination: if therefore a person who thinks he has seen a spectre proves to have been frightened before-hand, or at the first sight, his testimony is to be discarded of course.

What is called in common language "The Vapors," is a state of mind totally unexplained. A clergyman in this state was once alarmed in the dark, and fancied he saw spectres. On giving me some of the particulars, I told him I believed he had only had an affection of this kind, and was able to give him some evidence that such was the fact. The nature of this affection is very peculiar. The person in certain states, (I do not know what,) when standing, or lying, or sitting, fancies human beings, generally deformed, presenting themselves before him, and thinks himself talking to them, perhaps walking among them. His eyes are generally shut at the time, though he imagines them open. These appearances often correspond exactly with descriptions given of spectres; and we may suppose that deceptions are produced in this manner on those who think they have seen apparitions.

A pretty large part of the cases in which spectres have been reported to have appeared have never been enquired into. I was once passing at night between a friend's house and my own, when I saw something lying upon a fence, which I thought resembled a child which was sick in my house. I approached the place, when a large cat jumped from the fence. I have made it a rule to investigate every strange appearance I see, and find out whether there is really any thing wonderful in it. I was once just about to retire to bed, having

already put out the candle, when I observed a bright light on the floor and the side of the room. It did not show the sash of the window, as I thought it would have done if it had shone in from without, nor did it assume any distinct form. After a short time it disappeared, and I never was able to explain it in any manner: but nothing afterwards occurred which could be connected with it; and the cause was no doubt a natural one, which I could not ascertain for the want of knowledge. The appearance of any thing extraordinary does not necessarily prove any thing in favor of spectres, but only shows our ignorance. If every singular appearance were carefully examined into, the number of spectres would be lessened. But this is not often done. We take the account given by a person in a fright, and it has generally passed through several mouths before it reaches a man at all prepared to receive it with caution. Every case which I have been able to investigate has turned out as an occurrence according with the laws of nature; and I believe other observers, with proper attention, would come to the same result.

I would admit a story of a spectre, if as well attested as any proved in a court of justice. Make out such a case, and I will believe it. It is within the power of God to make spectres appear: there is no contradiction involved in it. Still, arguing from facts, it seems to me most probable that they do not appear: though I cannot prove that they do not.

DISPUTE XXXIII.

March 29th, 1814.

Question. *Does Temptation diminish the turpitude of a Crime?*

Remark 1st. Courts of justice regard the intention, but the temptation also.

Remark 2d. Every man ought to obey government, whether he has made a contract with it or not. So on the other hand, if he had committed murder, I should hang him, whether he had agreed to the social compact or no.

Remark 3d. Adam and Eve found mercy, but the fallen angels did not. It has been thought that Adam and Eve were thus favored, because they were more ignorant, and therefore did not sin against so much light. It seems as if this were reasonable. The case of Adam and Eve then does not argue in favor of the doctrine that temptation diminishes the turpitude of a crime.

Remark 4th. As soon as physical motives to do evil are offered to us, then temptation begins. Temptations exist in Heaven, and the fallen angels found them there.

Remark 5th. There are two kinds of desires in the human mind: 1st. those which are innocent in

their nature, but which may become wrong by being carried to excess; 2d. those which are wrong in their nature. I believe that the desire of property is right. The love of the esteem of others is certainly right, but not in the manner in which ambitious men entertain it. Envy is always wrong. The desire of physical good, I think, is always right, when not exercised immoderately.

DECISION. MARCH 30th.

This question has been commonly argued *a priori*, but I have been dissatisfied with this mode. If you can be sure that you have before you all the necessary considerations, and can let them have their full weight, there is no objection against pursuing this course. But it seems to me that some persons take into view only a part of the considerations which they ought, and arrive at conclusions so often against experience and facts, that I should rather go to facts. Arguing with facts is so beneficial, on all practical subjects, that I give it the preference, and I think I often detect errors in those who pursue the opposite course. Let us examine some of the arguments *a priori*.

If the temptation is diminished to an infinite degree, it is said by some, it reduces the crime to nothing. I think that here is a serious errror, because,

1st. They do not bring into distinct view all that belongs to the subject. I have told you, that if the greatest motives presented to man in any case independently of the evil heart, were in favor of wrong, there could be no criminality in preferring it. But such a case can never be. God has offered us his love as a

reward of our obedience: this is the greatest of all motives. There never will be, and never can be a case in which sin will not be a crime, and a very great crime. God says sin "is that abominable thing which I hate."

2d. They do not distinguish between motives and temptations. We can make motives great by the intenseness of our inclinations; or they may be great in themselves. Here are two persons who behold a motive. There is no inclination in one of them to make it stronger than it is: but the other may have a very strong desire, which makes it far more powerful to one, than to the other. The bias of the man, the state of the inclinations, make the motive very great or very small. The difference of feelings is well expressed in the short story of the man who had a controversy with Deacon B———. The former told the latter he would do him all the harm in his power. The Deacon replied, that he would do him all the good in his power.

The criminality, in every case, lies in the inclinations: not at all in the temptation. We are now to ask whether the turpitude consists in the temper. If a man should have a physical thing presented for which he had a strong desire, and sin in consequence, we should consider him as less culpable than if he were more indifferent towards it. If a student should beat another without provocation, he would be thought more culpable than if he had been attacked first. There was a man by the name of Bell, who was among the young men of this town when they came up to threaten the students. While they were disputing

near the corner of the yard, he pushed one of the students, and a number of them went out of the yard, took him, and brought him in by force, to punish him by pumping. Now in this act they would not be thought to have been as blameable as if they had done it without provocation.

The Jews and other nations have distinguished between manslaughter and murder. This distinction would not be made, unless temptation had been supposed to have diminished the turpitude of a crime. Sober legislatures have decided in the same manner in many instances; and God himself has drawn this distinction. A child goes to a pear tree, belonging to a stranger, and gets some of the pears. I do the same. I, being a man, ought not to have been tempted by the fruit as strongly as the child, and therefore am more culpable.

I think the doctrines of the Scriptures acknowledge this distinction. "There hath no temptation befallen you except what is common to all men." We also read of being "tempted beyond measure." There are other passages bearing the same views.

I take it that human feelings go the same way. A schoolmaster will not whip a boy so much for striking another with provocation, as if he had been struck first himself. All courts do the same; and I remark that all lawyers, divines and magistrates say, that the crime, where there is less temptation, is more criminal than where there is more, but yet some are unwilling to declare in what temptation consists.

It is said that it is injurious to morality to admit this principle. I never thought that truth was unfriendly to morality. I do not perceive that this principle

is often used to extenuate crimes. No sober man of this country, so far as I know, ever will commit a crime because it is not so bad as another. If it were a fact that the doctrine were thus applied, and by sober men, I should think it entailed a suspicion of the doctrine. Instead, however, of entertaining any apprehension of such a result, I should think that the contrary principle would prove very hurtful in its influence on the community. According to it, how would the servant that knew not his Lord's will and did it not, be less culpable than he that knew it and refused to obey? The former had less temptation offered him. I cannot help believing, that such is the meaning of this doctrine of our Saviour; and that to interpret it differently will be acted on at the Day of Judgment.

I think, therefore, without carrying the subject farther, that temptation does diminish the turpitude of a crime.

DISPUTE XXXIV.

March 30th, 1814.

Question. *Ought Manufactures to be encouraged in the United States?*

Remark 1st. There is no difference between the capacity of our countrymen and Englishmen. In triple-gilt buttons we equal them. In cloths, perhaps we do not equal them, in the finest: what are called superfine cloths in England. The superfine London cloths are much like our superfine flour: that is, all that is not bran. In plating we equal them. There is nothing in the story of American imbecility. There is not a workman in the world like Mr. Whitney, in the same branches. There is nothing known in Europe about fitting the parts of muskets as he does, unless they have stolen the art from him: this business they well know. In this country we have devised a method of setting card teeth which was unknown. We have invented a way to spin yarn by one woman, thirty runs in a day, with a nap to it, which their manufacturers have pronounced impossible.

Remark 2d. Mr. David Dale, of Glasgow in Scotland, set up cotton machinery, and had 1,200 people employed at it. He was a religious man, and built a church and had preaching for them. He had schools

also, and made the children attend twice a day. The clergymen had as orderly a congregation as most can boast of. This is not owing to the cotton manufactories, but to David Dale. Common manufacturers have the same opportunity to learn as cattle have. What would students learn if they were sent here, and left to take care of themselves?

Remark 3d. Words ending in *ible* and *able* always mean power. *Proportionable* is often used instead of *Proportional.*

Remark 4th. England contains one hundred and ninety-eight people to a square mile; France one hundred and ninety-six and a fraction, according to late calculations. Massachusetts, Rhode-Island and Connecticut contain but sixty to a square mile.

DECISION. APRIL 1st.

The arguments in favor of the establishment of manufactures in the United States, are such as these. 1st. That they will render us independent. 2d. Our situation will be made less precarious. 3d. We should secure to ourselves the articles necessary in time of war. 4th. That we should have fewer causes of war. 5th. They would give us wealth by having all our labor performed here, and all the results of it employed in our own country.

1st. *Independence.* This is the chief subject on which the friends of manufactures rely. What is independence? We may become independent, 1st. By wanting nothing. 2d. By getting every thing. But where is the man who can place himself in this situation? We must be dependent on one another. I

think the wants of a man are like those of a country. Who is not dependent upon a barber, a blacksmith, a tailor? The rich man is the most dependent of all as to labor. Mr. Jefferson wished to have those on our borders friends rather than enemies, and therefore urged the extension of our boundaries. But the inhabitants of the regions about the Rocky Mountains are as much strangers, and as likely to be enemies, as those at the Mississippi. He wanted no outside row to his field. A man may contract his wants. If we were satisfied to wear drugget, we might get sheep enough to supply ourselves with clothing. If we could eat dogs, we could easily obtain sufficient food. If we will ride in horse carts, they will cost little; and if we will walk, it will cost less. But to all this we are not inclined. We look far for conveniences and luxuries. Our own country produces very little gold or silver: but many think that coined eagles are very pretty things, especially when in his own chests or purses.

In my opinion pecuniary independence consists in having enough to exchange for what we want. Now it is said, that we are to be made independent by manufacturing. England is dependent for wood, grain, flax, hemp, tea, and many other articles. She is dependent on the Dutch for codfish, who catch them on her shores. Yet they complain bitterly of their dependence. Men will raise and produce such things as they can with the least expense. England will raise pines perhaps, but how? By stoves and green houses; and this will prove so expensive that they will rather be sent for to the West Indies. I love rice: but I must go to South-Carolina for it. I want money to pay for

it; and how shall I get it? I teach you, young gentlemen.

A country will be dependent, in one sense, if it wants what another has got. In another way it may be dependent, when it has not the means of defence, and is compelled to go to some foreign nation, cap in hand, to obtain protection. I have not the same views of dependence which many have. I believe that God made men necessary to each other, in order that a sense of our dependence might lead us to treat one another as we ought. So I think is the fact in relation to different countries, except in matters of defence. The miser must bar his house, and so must a country always take measures for defence against its enemies.

On the other hand, it is the opinion of some, that we cannot establish manufactures, for the want of capital, and the want of skill; and that if we could, and should make the experiment, we must adopt unjust laws, and expose ourselves to the vice, diseases and disorderly spirit to which manufacturing nations are subject. Let us examine these objections.

2d. *Vice.* It is true that countries in which manufactures abound, have suffered much from the vicious tendency of the work people. The English speak of the cotton manufacturers as absolutely profligate; and yet David Dale succeeded in making his workmen virtuous. Colonel Humphrey has done the same in his manufactory at Humphreyville in this state; and the Selectmen of that town have stated that they receive instruction, have a school and public worship on the Sabbath, and are of good habits, and peaceable in their behavior. Beside this, they enjoy remarkable health.

Instead of employing steam, they use water, which is vastly superior on several accounts. Now manufacturing may be carried on to a great extent in this country by water. Our mill streams, as I know from observation, are powerful enough to turn all the machinery that the country can want. They have generally all the descent of water desirable, and enough of it for every purpose. The use of water in manufacturing, it is to be remembered, is very cheap and very healthful. In some processes it would be necessary to use steam, or to keep the air constantly heated with stoves; to what extent this may prove unwholesome I do not know. Some kinds of manufacturing are necessarily unhealthy.

3d. *Morality.* Manufacturers should be compelled to guard the morals of their work people. The state of Connecticut has begun to compel those in this state to employ their men with such a reference to their morals, that they may enjoy advantages for establishing good characters; and Colonel Humphrey regards this as conferring a benefit on the manufacturers themselves.

4th. *Health.* I believe the work people at Humphreyville are as healthy as any in the state. Their food, employments and amusements tend to health, as facts have proved. No other people have so generally escaped the prevailing disease as they, although the neighboring inhabitants have suffered from it as much as we. Manufacturers may in many cases be sober, virtuous, and in health. Whether it can always be so or not, I cannot tell. In different parts of England the manufacturers are represented to be as dissolute as pos-

sible, and they have diseases of a separate class, on which large volumes have been written. They are peculiar to those districts, and very deadly; and these examples should put us on our guard, though I do not know that all manufacturing places are to expect to suffer from the same cause.

5th. *Skill.* Our countrymen have not the same skill as the European manufacturers, but they may be so educated as to acquire it. There are no people more ingenious, especially in manufactures of different kinds, and they are fast advancing in them. Our superfine broadcloth is already as good as the European, and our gold and silver wormanship is not much inferior. It is skilful enough to satisfy us. In some things we are lame; but there are reasons for it. We do not manufacture mathematical instruments: why? There is no demand for them. I believe, however, we shall be able to do it by and by.

6th. *Cheapness.* We can make superfine cloths cheap, but not coarse ones. Those things which are done by dint of labor must be dearer with us than in Europe. At Leeds, cloth is made in families, where, you will observe, time can be applied at the greatest possible advantage, and there will be inducements to every one to use the best efforts to excel. In 1810 the cloth woven in this manner amounted to seventeen thousand yards. Now I should not have thought it had been as many inches. It is wonderful how much is woven in this country. In an old state of society, you cannot abridge human labor, without depriving a great many persons of their subsistence. In England, therefore, there cannot well be an

abridgment of labor introduced. It would necessarily bring distress upon a greater or less number of persons whose services would be rendered unnecessary.

In our own country, on the contrary, every abridgment of labor is evidently a blessing. And if we manufacture, we should begin on the plan of abridging as much as possible; for the more cheaply we can obtain the means of comfort, the better is our condition. If ten stockings are made instead of one, it is a gain to the country. Manufactories besides would furnish employment to many children who now run about the streets, as well as to many men and women who do nothing. Thus the country would gain, and these also, who would in this manner be furnished with the means of subsistence. The highest workmen in England receive higher wages than our best: but our lowest wages will sustain a man.

Give the manufacturer encouragement by raising wages, if it is for public defence, to extend, improve or introduce any species of manufacture; but not otherwise. If you can get the productions of our manufacturers on terms as favorable to ourselves as those on which we can supply ourselves from abroad, I should say let us take them. But if you are to drive up our manufactories till they equal the Europeans, you had better let them alone.

DISPUTE XXXV.

April 5th, 1814.

Question. *Is Privateering Justifiable?*

DECISION.

In the first place—The great defence of privateering is made on the ground that it is agreeable to the laws of nations. These laws have been established partly on two foundations:—1st. The law of nature; and 2d. The law of God.

When we appeal to the law of nations, we appeal first to principles which we suppose ought, from their own nature, to be maintained; and then to give strength to our positions, we appeal to agreements made between nations, in which they have been avowed.

If we have just views of the law of nations, we shall come at once to this conclusion: that such a law must be imperfect as a rule of conduct between men. When nations form treaties, it is perfectly well known that each generally gets as much as it can; consulting only its own supposed benefit, and yielding nothing that it can retain. With respect to questions which they sometimes undertake to decide, questions involving important principles, it is no less true that the determination is often affected by selfish considera-

tions, which render it very different from that which would have been given by a common judicial tribunal, and at variance from the law of God. All nations are marching with a rapid step towards the recognition of the law of nations: but it is not to be supposed that they as yet embrace all that they ought. When nations undertake to determine a question, disputes arise, and we have passion to sit as umpire. We are to yield something, as well as something to demand: and we as well as others are resolved to hold as much as we can. The consequence is that a compromise is to be made, or nothing can be done; and though reason might require a decision wholly on one side, it must be made on some middle ground. The laws of nations therefore, are not always agreeable to those of nature, or to those of God; and must be regarded as a lame code, in relation to their obligations on mankind. Writers, therefore, who quote the law of nations as authority, appeal to what is imperfect, instead of going to the law of God. Yet much has been gained by the progress already made by nations in fixing important principles. They do not now ordinarily burn their culprits, nor throw them from the Tarpeian Rock. We have gained much, compared with nothing, but little in comparison with what we want, for there are important principles which have not yet been acknowledged by nations. You well know what importance I give to facts: but yet principles which can be proved by common sense, I regard as established, and I maintain them with firmness; and you will observe, there is no decision of common sense unless in favor of the melioration of the evils of war.

There are some men who advocate privateering; but do you take away those who are engaged in it, and you will find all others dead against it. Those whose interests are enlisted in the employment are loud in its defence, for they wish to see it continued, and they know that the sense of their countrymen is against it. It is objected to any interference with privateering, that this is merely one part of a great evil, and that we should go to the root, and exterminate war. This is said with more truth than sense: for one of the steps to be taken for the extermination of war, is to destroy privateering. The only means by which we can aid to effect this great object, situated as we are in this country, is by clipping off principle after principle. I do not say that it must all be done at once, or that nothing must be attempted. The strong man who seized the whole horse's tail at a grasp, was not able to pull it out, while the weak man in time succeeded by pulling out hair by hair.

It has been asserted by some writers, that during a war between two countries, every man in each nation is an enemy of every one in the other. Suppose I have a friend now living in Great Britain: if I should meet him, would it be my duty to kill him? You would not say it would be, any of you. But it may be said that such a case should be regarded as an exception, and that the rule may properly be applied to all who are strangers to each other. But why should we be required to entertain such feelings? We cannot be at war with persons whom we know nothing about. The fact consequently is, that a large part of the people of a country, in a time of war, are not enemies to those of

the country engaged in a contest with them. The governments may be at war, while the people are not. It often happens, therefore, that while this state continues, a correspondence is kept up, as far as practicable, between individuals, with expressions of good will.—Friends are not of course lost to each other. In accordance with this fact is the humane treatment now enjoyed by prisoners in civilized countries, where, as is customarily remarked, even if taken in arms, a man, from the moment of his capture, is not treated as an enemy.

What are the feelings of the French at the present time? Do they feel any personal hostility towards the people of the countries with which France is at war? They are chained and dragged to the field, and forced to fight. So unwilling are they to engage in the campaign against the Russians, that parents conceal their sons, or pay large sums for their release. When we speak of nations, we are often liable to make mistakes, by taking the word in different senses. When we speak of two nations as at war, we are apt to feel as if the persons who compose them, were actuated by bitter hatred towards each other, than which nothing is often further from the truth. In England and this country, the clergy are in the habit of praying for a termination of war, whenever it exists.

Among the principles which should be acknowledged by all nations, is this, that so far as is not necessary for the destruction of the public force of an enemy in time of war, we have no right to destroy private property. Paley says, that we have a right to make a slave of a captive: but when he made this re-

mark, he certainly forgot the dictates of Christianity. We must treat a captive as a human being: we must do unto others as we would that others should do unto us. Notwithstanding the general principle of war, it is also right that every person who is, by his employment, a benefactor to mankind, by contributing to the stock of food for man, whether as an agriculturist, a fisherman, or otherwise, should be spared in war, as far as is consistent with the speedy termination of hostilities. The people of Vermont, while there is war with Great Britain, do not cross the boundary and lay waste the country of their neighbors in Canada. No one would say that to prey upon them would be to reduce the force of the country, which is the object of military operations. This principle is acknowledged by civilized men, but not by savages. When General Clark, on a certain occasion, found some of his soldiers about to burn a private house, he ordered one of them to be brought out and shot: but Brandt interfered, and said: "No, I will not consent to it." Our country is ashamed of the burning of Newark. The British are, or ought to be, ashamed of the burning of the Moravian village, and other similar scenes; and these deeds will be a stain on them and us as long as history has a pen to write. The governments regret them: they feel like boys who have been robbing an orchard, and both are ready to say, "I didn't do it."

Now here is a principle settled, so far as it relates to private property on land; and where is the difference between it and that at sea? If the capture or destruction of it will not weaken the public force in such a manner as to aid in ending the war, what reason can

there be for seizing or destroying it? And with respect to those who have it in charge, what difference is there between men at peace on the water and on land? Their property is not different from other property, and the men are like other peaceable men. If a ship with a cargo of broadcloths is seized by a cruiser, why is it not as unreasonable as if it were taken by an armed force after being landed? There is no difference between the cases, except this—you can come at the former: this is the charm, here is the reason; and you need not seek any other. The owner of the privateer regards not the real merits of the case; and if he had it in his power to do it with safety, he would plunder a house.

But it is said, that, by sending privateers against an enemy, we cripple him. This is an assertion often made; and if I had the nonsense of Don Quixotte I would believe it: but if I had the sobriety of Sancho Panza I would not.

What difference will it make, whether we take English property going to the Cape of Good Hope, before or after its arrival?

But what are the feelings which induce men to engage in privateering, and governments to permit them? They are feelings of pelf: not at all above those of thieves and robbers, and not a whit better. The scheme is to take property for nothing, without regard to right; and doing it in a privateer is just the same as doing it on the highway. It is declared by many to be necessary, to be honorable and to be just: accordingly, those who thirst for wealth and care not how they get it, go out to rob, and the government sets

them on. These feelings, thus excited and encouraged, do harm enough to overbalance all the loss of money that might be apprehended in abstaining from the practice. They produce a mass like that left behind by the yellow fever.

It is said that the laws will check some of the evils anticipated from this practice. But, although privateersmen are amenable to the government, there is not an instance of their being brought forward to account for their misconduct, either in this war or the last, so far as I know.

But see what sort of men are entrusted with power in privateers. Those who engage in war on board of national ships, feel that their motives are comparatively good; but those who go in privateers are indifferent about consciences, and go with very bad ones. The consequence is that the characters of men employed in public and private armed ships is very different. The mind becomes affected by familiarity with deeds of violence and scenes of blood. The heart is hardened with double rapidity compared even with the miser's.

You will observe that wealth gotten by iniquity does not last. I have noticed this for forty years, and it is almost always true. Thieves do not retain property: gamblers do not; and the truth has passed into this familiar though homely proverb: "What is got over the devil's back, is spent under his belly." It consequently happens, that every privateersman is almost of course a beggar. Mark the destruction of principle which ensues; the injury of the public interests. Observe the fallacy of attributing privateering to the love of public good, and ask whether this evil system

is ever to be bettered. Is a nation always to contain these people, and to permit them to prey on private property and destroy lives whenever it is at war? Must we not attempt a reformation? If not, it is because we have not integrity enough, or humanity enough, to obey the dictates of nature.

DISPUTE XXXVI.

Question. *Ought the Interest of Money to be regulated by Law?*

Remark 1st. Adam Smith and certain other writers on the subject, say, that if a person lends money to several men who are secure debtors, and to one who is not, he may properly raise the rate on the secure to guard against exposure to loss by the insecure. This is not justifiable. Am I to pay for another's insecurity? They say also, that the interest on the insecure borrower is to be increased, when there is but one. But this will only saddle him with a greater sum; and if he cannot pay the smaller, will he pay the larger? By no means. Besides, he will be constantly discouraged by having a large debt hanging over him, and less likely to make his best exertions to discharge it. In such a case a man will be even less disposed to use his best endeavors than in the other. The growth of debts from interest, is like the stone cut out of the mountain without hands: it is small at first, but at length becomes a mountain, and fills the whole earth. It is like the mustard seed, which is indeed the smallest of all seeds, but when it is grown, it becometh a tree, so that the fowls of the air (especially those of prey) come and lodge in the branches.

Remark 2d. The law which renders the creditor of usury unable to recover his debt, is intended to keep him from lending at usury. The nature of man is so bad, that the debtor will often refuse to pay under this provision. He makes the law, or the want of law, his plea, though the debt may have been contracted under solemn obligations. It is then owing to the nature of man that the payment is not made, and not to the law; and non-payment affords no argument against the law.

Remark 3d. We must lay much stress on the agreement of men in matters founded on experience, and it has been a very common practice to limit the rate of interest by law, in different countries. This proves that they have thought it useful after trial. Lady Mary Wortley Montague, soon after her arrival in Constantinople, went into a Turkish bath, where, on leaving it, she was obliged to submit to the disagreeable and somewhat painful process of having her limbs pulled by the attendants. She found however that the effects were very pleasant, as it made her feel more active and vigorous for some time. The exercise seems at first to a stranger quite useless and nonsensical; but the Turks have found by experience that its influence is salutary. I have made experiments with this process on my fingers, in consequence of the remark made by Lady Mary. They are apt to be rheumatic, and I pull them every time I feel the pain; and I think it is owing to this practice that my fingers are not now useless.

DECISION.

The two objections made against regulating the interest of money by law, are that it is unjust, and that it is unwise. If unjust, it ought not to be resorted to; and this alone would render it unwise. The several views in which the injustice is said to appear are these:

1st. *That* it distinguishes money by a species of regulation which does not belong to any other kind of property. Wheat, wine, other articles of food, and in short almost every species of merchandize, is free from restrictions of this kind, and every man is permitted to make his own bargain in lending or borrowing them. The law gives every thing that the "salus populi" demands. It meddles sometimes and sometimes not. It does not meddle with merchandize or farmers' lands, because it sees no occasion. The market regulates such things better than the laws could do. But when the merchant or the farmer oppresses any of his fellow men, they stop him by such regulations as are designed for their protection. The law forms banking companies, turnpike-road companies, &c. &c. meddling just so far with such concerns as the good of the people requires. It regulates the exchange of food when it thinks it necessary. Sometime ago there was thought to be danger of a scarcity of corn, and the law prevented the corn from going out of the country. Our private rights are to be limited in consistency with the public good; and the whole business of municipal proceedings depends upon this principle: "*Salus populi suprema lex esto.*" It controls the circumstances of men

just as it pleases; and otherwise nothing can be determined without some particular law of God. It is idle to talk of any other rights. The gains of men are regulated every where, and necessarily so. It is remarkable that men never think of finding fault when a banking company is not permitted to lend to what persons they please, and at their own rates of interest. Now where is the difference between regulating public and private lenders? Private people alone would do it in secret if allowed, and do it more to the injury of others. But every man approves and demands this regulation; for it is evident that without it banks would become engines of oppression.

2d. It is objected that it is unjust, because a man has a right to do what he will with his property; that a lender runs risks; and that money fluctuates in value. On this last I observe, people are always ready to get the rate fixed when it is at the highest. But consider: when a hundred dollars is worth more than it has been, is not four dollars worth just as much more in proportion? They both follow the same scale. The rise of the money and the fall are just the same in the four or six per cent. as in the dollars.

But it is said, that the man can make more by his money if left free in lending it. By what will he make? The laborer's work becomes worth more when the rate of interest rises, and therefore the laborer will demand more for it. The money is worth more in business, but merely because that which the borrower does with it is worth more. If a man does not wish to lend his money, he can go into partnership with an active man. He wants to lie by and do nothing, and eat the honey which the bees have gathered.

All business is open to the borrower or the active partner: he can be a sea captain, or a commission merchant, or whatever he will. Now where is the necessity of his having more privileges? You will remember that I have lent almost all my money, so that I am now advising in the teeth of selfishness.

The community mean to discourage idleness. The lender does not do any thing: his own labors do not add one particle to the stock of the community, nor does he aim to employ his money so that it may be a public advantage. "If any will not work, neither let him eat." This is the law of God. I would give a lazy man a meal: but if he would not work I would not give him another. It is right to lend money: but it is not right to make it a cardinal pursuit. It should not be made a business. I went some years ago to Newport: the war was raging and the people were poor. I found the state of things was this. A few of the inhabitants were merchants: but the richest lent money and others borrowed, and the town was thus impoverished. All human prosperity arises from human industry. It is the well-spring of human happiness. Loaning money, as a business, is the fætor of the Bohon Upas: it spreads death around it. Men may do it occasionally, and with good intentions: but the habit of doing it as a regular employment, is dangerous to morality and to the good of society.

3d. The third objection is, that there is injustice as well as folly in laws regulating the interest of money, because they will be evaded. If this is a solid objection to any law, it would be argument enough against all: for any other law is likewise exposed to be evaded, ex-

cept—"Go and do as you have a mind to." We make a law forbidding murder, and all other heinous crimes. Are they not all evaded? We add one forbidding the violation of the sabbath: would any one of you have it repealed because it is broken? I am afraid you would make a thin volume of your code, if you were to repeal every law which is not strictly and universally regarded.

4th. The fourth objection to laws regulating the interest of money is, that you encourage fraud. You do not encourage it. A man intends to steal, and borrows on usury. He does not pay it. The man is a villain: yet I am willing the usurer should be punished. It would be wrong to say that book debts should last forever, though a man may lose what is justly his, by the law that limits the time within which their collection may be compelled. It is better that a few men should suffer, than that the community should be subject to all the evils which would otherwise be brought upon it. A good law may give occasion to do evil, and yet the law be good. Here is then no objection to the regulation of the interest of money by law, though I allow it its whole weight.

5th. The fifth reason used against the regulation of interest is: that it will cause the lending of money out of the community, and where the interest is higher. We have long lived adjoining New-York, where the lawful rate of interest is seven per cent. while among us in Connecticut it is only six. There is money enough to be lent here in spite of this. Our new banks are always subscribed to as much as is necessary. It

is said however that the tendency will be to drive lenders away. Let them go: it won't hurt any body to be rid of them.

Now let me remark to you, that the design of the law is to protect the poor, the ignorant, the young, the self-confident, and others, who in this manner need protection. If you do not protect these members of society, you expose it to serious evils. Every man thinks he can make money well: just as every body thinks he will at his own time, and in his own way, turn to repentance. But on both these subjects they often deceive themselves. Let those who feel confident be cautious. Let those who are sanguine look out for the consequences. Those who are in trouble see nothing but the present evil. The young want something, and to obtain it borrow money. You have no conception, young gentlemen, of the fierceness with which the lenders will grind the faces of their fellow men. A poor man in this town went to one who had several hundred thousand dollars, and begged of him a little for the necessaries of life. The rich man was busy, and told him he would think about it. He applied again; and that threw him into a rage, instead of moving his sympathy. Young men are generous: but these men are as hard as any quartz in Mr Gibbs' cabinet. They are the hawks: the young, the robins.

Now common sense, remember, regulates money lenders. When men make a law, they observe their own interest. Why did they make this law? Because they are obliged to do so. The whole body of the Roman Senate were money lenders, and many other legislators are composed of the same materials. These laws

which they have passed are right in the teeth of avarice; and yet we find that similar laws have been made, where there has been money to lend and to borrow, in every country under heaven, from the days of Moses down to the present time; and this has been done, although counteracted by the selfishness of many of the men by whom they were framed and adopted. They grew out of experience in the most corrupt feelings of men; and that in all countries, and in all ages. What has produced this result? The necessities of the community.

But you will observe that the law is obeyed, and every man's state is consequently affected by it. You cannot accomplish the objects desired any other way. Orphans and widows are to be taken care of by laws: they often have money laid up for them, and without a fixed rate of interest, its value could not be fixed. All Christians will conform to this law; though among them will be many who lend money. All men who intend to sustain decent characters in the community will conform to the law. They cannot deviate securely: their borrowers would betray them. Every reasonable man can get money at six per cent. You can do it at banks; and while this can be done, men will not go to others to borrow. This system cuts up usury by the roots; and the fact that it produces this effect, abundantly proves that the law regulating the interest of money is extensively executed, and as extensively as any law. There will be men who will be fools, it is true: but this evil, law cannot prevent.

I would never encourage lending money; but I would open the door to judicious men to borrow

money. The experience of other countries is in my favor. Perhaps a community of commercial people might do without a law on the subject of interest; but I should be sorry to have such a law repealed.

Young gentlemen, never borrow money unless you can pay it at the time appointed. The person who practices borrowing on any other plan, will be a beggar, and probably end in a jail.

DISPUTE XXXVII.

April 12th, 1814.

Question. *Is Duelling Justifiable?*

Remark 1st. The ancient duels were not on the same principles as those of the present day. There were no established rules concerning them. The challenged was not necessarily bound to accept. The case was not a case of honor. This makes a wonderful difference. Duels have been practised in all nations, no doubt. Our savages do it. They attack with knives, and intend to kill at all events.

In the duels of England, the object was, not to kill, but to vanquish. They were resorted to on account of some violation of the laws of England: the duel was not in opposition to the laws; and this makes a great difference between ancient and modern duelling.

Remark 2d. It is in vain here to quote examples. A gentleman of Massachusetts Bay, distinguished by great common sense, (in old times, while Massachusetts was a colony,) once remarked to me, that his father once well said that he had seen many great men, but they all had bad spots in them.

DECISION.

This subject of Duelling will come up to your view when you study Paley. I shall then consider what he says on it, and shall not now enter into the subject so extensively as I otherwise would. I have also preached upon it; but probably the arguments are now out of your minds. I shall now make a few observations which may not occur to me again.

1st. It is viewed as the reparation of an injury. The reparation then must consist in this: that the duellist renders evil for evil. This will be a bad thing to give an account of when we come to the Day of Judgment. God has prohibited it absolutely. He has commanded us to love those who hate us, to forgive those who injure us, and to pray for those who despitefully use us and persecute us. These are the persons whom the duellist challenges, if he thinks his case sufficiently promising. If he is wounded, he must perhaps submit to having the truth told, which a good man would be always ready for. It will not always be right to tell a person of his faults; but we ought to submit to it. The person who has done evil, ought himself to take patiently the punishment of the evil. To a very great extent it is true, that this is not patiently submitted to. In some instances it has been, but the cases are very rare. In some instances a man has trodden upon the toe of another: in some instances he has stared upon him, and a duel has been the consequence.

A French officer in the army of Count de Grasse, was once at table with an officer of the American army, soon after the capture of Yorktown. During a con-

versation which occurred on that subject, he observed the American fix his eyes often and steadily upon him. Taking offence at this, he enquired of a gentleman near him, what was the character and standing of the American, and was told that they were good. He then desired one of his friends to enquire of him why he had gazed at him in so peculiar a manner. The American heard the question with some surprise, but smiled and replied, that it gave him pleasure to look at him, as he thought him the handsomest man he had ever seen. The Frenchman afterwards remarked, that if he had been stared at in that manner in France, he would certainly have challenged the man immediately.

But we are told by the advocates of duelling, that there are insults to which gentlemen are exposed, against which there is no adequate defence but a challenge. We must be exposed to insults as we pass through life, and be prepared to meet them; but there is no difficulty in getting along in spite of them. It is only for us to determine that we will take no notice of an insult, and we shall find that it will do us no harm. I know this by experience. I have adopted a homely English adage with regard to persons who love to give insults: "If they are mad, let them scratch." If you adopt the same, you will find no difficulty in getting along with them. It does not give me half the uneasiness to receive an insult, that it does to go from home and leave my snuff-box: and you may know this is not much.

I advise you to set out in life with this determination, to look charitably on the faults of others. Many and many a one who has given offence, is heartily

sorry for the wrong he has done. It is hard to increase the troubles of men who are laboring under such deep regret for their conduct; and it does not require the benevolence of the Gospel to compassionate them. It is hardly worth while to wound such a person more deeply than he is wounded already. The person who has inflicted injuries and is sorry for them, bears, at least in my eye, a very fair and honorable character for a man: more so than some of those whose character is constitutionally more uniform, who are at once less exposed to errors and less ready to make reparation. Now in the case of receiving such an insult as those that have been alluded to, nothing, I think, should be done. Let it go.

Some think that the fear of a challenge checks the disposition to give insults, and administers to the peace of society. Facts are better than theory. In the country of New-England there have been but five duels since its first settlement by white men. One of these took place between two English servants, soon after the foundation of Plymouth colony, who were tied neck and heels for twenty-four hours. Another was between two New-York men, who left their own state, and came over to Horseneck to fight. During the Revolution there were two duels fought while the army lay near Boston. One of them was at Dorchester Heights. Now this shows that the practice I have recommended does not induce men to injure or insult each other. Instead of resorting to duelling to establish a proper intercourse in society, we have substituted the best and most effectual means. We make a man generally despised, who violates truth or good manners among us. The

public opinion is dead against him. The point of honor, so much talked about by duellists, has no existence here: and the arguments they found upon it are nothing but words. The point of honor is to comply with the rules of truth and propriety in our intercourse with each other.

But it is asserted, that duelling must be resorted to, effectually to wipe off the stain of an insult from the character which has been aspersed. A man has his toe trodden on. What is to be done in such a case? Shall he determine never to forget it till he has had revenge? How long shall it be remembered? I believe it would not be forgotten at any rate until the toe had got well, but after that, in most cases, I presume many persons would never think of it again. But suppose it to have been intentional, and that the injured man should tell the aggressor that he could not respect him until he should make an acknowledgment: would not this secure him better treatment in future, and would it not be a course of conduct appropriate to the character of a man? And would not this manner of resenting injuries in general, be most like a rational being—most like a servant of God?

The motive which drives men to fight duels, is the opinion of the public; and that which prevents others from hazarding them is the fear of God. Now which of these motives is best founded? Some are most influenced by the fear of public opinion. Whoever is, is a fool and a coward. For what is the origin of public opinion, when it sets against a man who is unwilling to fight? It is fabricated by such men as themselves, without reason and against reason: yet

for it they will plunge themselves and their families into danger and distress.

This is to act the bedlamite, if it ever was acted. This scheme for preventing injuries is a foolish one, when its real tendency is regarded. For example: I am said to be a liar. Am I a liar, or not? If I kill the man who accuses me of being so, is that reparation? Is my character any better for it? Certain it is, that I have done him a greater injury than I have received, and a more irreparable one. Or, suppose a man has done me palpable wrong, by design, and I challenge him to shoot at me. He has cheated me out of a hundred pounds, and I give him a chance to cheat me out of much more—my life. Who, by any reasonable course, could claim any such thing? The cheated man is never to pay the debt. This however, is but a feeble presentation of the subject. The person supposed has cheated me: but it is only out of a little money. The duellist cheats me out of my life in both worlds. If he has belied me, and injured my reputation, I gain nothing by it if I kill him. His death will never convince any body that he spoke falsely. If my character is such as to claim confidence, all men will despise him for aspersing it, even if I take no measures for my own justification. But if I challenge and shoot him, I shall be condemned by the same just opinion, for a greater crime than that which he has committed.

Colonel Burr challenged General Hamilton. Mr. King sat up nearly a whole night, and exerted himself during a part of several days to dissuade him from accepting it. But he was unwise enough, with all his good counsellors, to go to the field. He was killed.

Has Burr gained any character by this event? So far from it, he is regarded but with one feeling by all.

Some men think that fighting a duel is evidence of a man's courage. I do not think much of this kind of courage. A shoe-black, a jack-tar or a common street-bully is stronger of nerves than most duellists, and may soon become an expert marksman by practice. A gentleman who had been in South-Carolina told me, that he had seen a man who had killed nine others in duels. His custom was to borrow money, and then to seek an opportunity to insult the lender, get a challenge from him, and shoot him. Duelling did not prevent insults from being given in his case, nor supply any deficiency in the laws. A New-England man once got into a quarrel with an expert duellist, who challenged him while they were at dinner together. The man who receives a challenge being allowed to choose the time and the weapons, the New-Englander immediately said he would fight now, and with pistols, across the table. The challenger objected; but finding it in vain, made a most humble apology for his conduct. This shows that a great duellist may be much afraid of losing his life. He had no apprehension of being fired at by an inexperienced man, at the usual distance: but if his antagonist should have the first fire, from across the table, he thought he should meet certain death. Two candidates for the office of representative once quarrelled in Virginia. A little before the election, one of them publicly stated that he was in possession of documents which proved his competitor to be entirely unworthy of public confidence, and thus obtained the majority. On the day after the election, a friend of the unsuccessful candidate called to demand a sight of the

documents, when it proved that none such existed. A challenge ensued; but an officer made his appearance on the field in time to prevent the duel. From the character of the new representative, it was probable that he had given information to the officer, as his antagonist was an expert marksman. The combatants then met on the territory of an adjacent state: but when they were about to fire, a man was discovered in a bush, with a rifle, prepared to shoot the friend of the unsuccessful candidate. In many cases duels have produced effects exactly opposite to those which are claimed to flow from them.

How different is the influence of such conduct as that of Colonel Gardner when he received a challenge, but refused to fight, on the ground that he feared God! No one who knew the parties, could have had any doubt which was the braver man.

But it is said that duelling may prevent much suffering in persons who have a very tender regard for their reputation, and who suffer pangs when it is wounded. I have been repeatedly published for nine years, as a man of no commendable character: but I have never lost a meal for it. Besides, I have never been treated the worse for these attacks, not even by the makers of the stories, yet I have not answered them. I value a good name: it "is better than precious ointment." But, let a man value it ever so much, though it be injured by the wilful conduct of another, and the suffering be as dreadful as you will, can it be wiped away by the death of the offender? Has God made our state in this world such, that this is the only effectual remedy?

Who was ever more blessed than the apostles, while

they were subject to indignities, falsehood and violence? And how did they endure their sufferings with such resignation and joy? They acted in obedience to the command of their Master: "Pray for them who despitefully use you." Now *quere* whether there is not in every mind a ready assent to the soundness and excellence of this injunction?

DECISION ON DUELLING CONCLUDED APRIL 15th.

It is insisted by duellists that the decision to which they refer their points of dispute is a fairer one than that to be obtained from a common tribunal: that they meet on equal ground, because they are men of honor. But their actions belie their professions. As Horace says, if you drive out the nature of such men with a pitch-fork it will return. There is no preventing them from fighting on unequal terms, if they can possibly do it. They are trained to shoot a pistol from early life, and will always have the advantage of an adversary if possible. There can be no equal ground for two duellists, unless they shoot alike. Would a contest between two men be equal, if one fought with a bludgeon, and the other used only his naked hands? By no means: yet there would be less inequality than there often is between duellists. Not a man engages in a duel who does not intend to have the contest unequal, and the advantage on his own side. Yet every duellist is a brave man: you have his word for it. He goes into the field to prove it: but the fact is, he does not mean to be killed in establishing the fact.

The King of Prussia was once informed that two

of his officers were about to fight a duel, and proceeded to the field, where they had made their preparations. He ordered them to proceed; and one of them, at the first fire, killed his antagonist. The king then called on the second of the dead man to shoot the surviving principal, which he did. The other second was then directed to fire at him, and after killing him, was himself shot by a soldier. His majesty then turned his horse and left the place; and this summary proceeding put an end to the fashion of duelling in his army. Duellists have no wish or intention to be killed; and the representation of the equal terms on which they appear in the field is entirely false.

There came a youth from the west of Virginia to one of the colleges of that state, who had been brought up in a religious family, but found himself placed in contact with infidels, and often engaged in arguments with them on the truths of religion. He generally succeeded in worsting his opponents, and soon raised much hostility against himself in consequence. Some of his companions determined to involve him in a duel, and succeeded in having a challenge presented and accepted. The youth chosen to fight him was an expert marksman; and a duel was resorted to expressly for the purpose of killing him whom they could not refute. This they accomplished. Away with the pretence that there is any fairness in settling questions by duels.

In the next place, you will observe that the duellist takes upon himself the adjudication of his own cause. This would be thought a wonderful proceeding in other cases. We go, by universal consent, to a

tribunal to have our differences settled; and no one would be foolish enough to pretend that a man ought to be permitted to sit as judge of his own cause. The person interested is prejudiced: he cannot be depended on to give a just decision; and no one thinks of leaving the question to him. Why should this plain principle ever be departed from, and such cases be referred to the duel? The most selfish, passionate and headstrong of all beings are thus made judges in their own cases, and instead of fairly consulting the facts presented in evidence, they do their utmost to destroy the life of their adversaries, whether they be in the right or the wrong. But it is said that the duellist is a man of honor, and that the privileges he claims are not to be granted to others. Who is a man of honor? Every one who claims to be so. Then every one will call himself so. A shoe-black will tell you that he is one; and, though not a gentleman, more honest than some who are acknowledged to be gentlemen. If you allow duels, you permit the most selfish men, in the most selfish of all cases, to perform the most difficult and delicate of duties: to determine disputes. You make the accuser, the judge, the jury and the executioner, all one. And think, how perfectly unreasonable this is. There is no person a greater fool than a proud man; no one who is less capable of judging. You might as well trust an avaricious man in his cause. And if you allow one person to manage his own cause, you must allow others. What then becomes of your judges, courts and lawyers? They are all perfectly insignificant. Carry the principle through, and you separate society, in much the same manner as the par-

ticles of dust are separated in a whirlwind. To talk of special judicatories independent of law, to settle disputes on the principle of duelling, and to pretend at the same time to sustain the principles of law, is as ridiculous as to attempt to bring together the two opposite points of heaven. In all rational views, was ever any thing as irrational as this?

All legislatures, accordingly, have been opposed to duelling. It roots up government. The legislature of Virginia have passed a law, that every man elected to an office in the state shall swear that he has not been engaged in a duel since the passage of that law. Of course duellists who aim at offices in Virginia are now met by their pride in the last point. You see how good sense and good principle in that state have triumphed over this dangerous practice: no law is better calculated to produce the effect than that. You will find the same principle elsewhere adopted in some manner or other; though by laws foolishly weak in a good many instances. There is need of more vigor and decision. A judge in New-York, some time since, when about to give a charge to a jury on a case of duelling, could not help pausing to look round upon his audience. On one side was the mayor: he had fought his duel. The attorney of the district was so lame he could not appear in court, from a wound he had received in one. The sheriff had been killed in another. All the jury were supposed to be favorable to duels; and several persons among the spectators had been engaged in them, as principals or seconds. This shows how ineffectual had been the law of that state, passed for their prevention. Although it declares death by a duel mur-

der, when a person has been indicted under it, the jury turn their backs upon it, and save the offender.

In England the laws proved in like manner very ineffectual against duelling, until the days of Lord Eldon. He was a Christian, and announced that duelling would for the future be regarded as murder, and Mr. Campbell was afterwards executed accordingly. I am apprehensive that the present Chief Justice has not sense enough, or principle enough to follow his steps. A few such decisions would have driven duelling out of the kingdom. The Virginia law is an excellent one, because it may so easily be rendered effectual. It is only necessary to require that men who have been chosen to offices shall take a certain oath, and the existence of the law will be a sufficient reason for not sending or accepting a challenge. Besides, duellists can thus be forever excluded from the judges' bench; and this is an important object. Hence the extreme wisdom of the law.

The right of private adjudication is subversive of government; and men who resort to it are its enemies. We thus load them with a heavy reproach: but they deserve it. Such a man is an enemy of his country, and a duellist is of the same nature. Make all men duellists, and the point is decided: your law is at an end.

With respect to what I have to say on the future allotment of the duellist, I will omit it till we come to Paley.

DISPUTE XXXVIII.

April, 1814.

Question. *Are Reviews beneficial?*

DECISION.

This is one of those questions which admit only of a New-Englander's answer: "some are good, some are bad, and some are indifferent."

The best account which I have seen, of the manner in which the English reviews are conducted is given in the "Picture of London." Still that account is defective, as it is chiefly confined to the disbursements of expenses for their support. The editor of a review generally professes to know every thing about the books which he speaks of; but it is stated that it is a common practice for a bookseller to employ persons to review the works he publishes, and then to pay the Reviewers for it, and thus gets an insertion in the Review. They have so much for so much. If they perform their work poorly, he will dismiss them. The number of persons thus employed in London is considerable, and their characters are different. In such a country as England, many are tempted to live by authorship, though the life is poor enough. Those who inhabit Grub-street are in such a state as fits them to write

such reviews. They are ready to do it, because their object is to keep soul and body together. They wish to please their employers, and at as little expense and trouble as possible. Therefore, it is stated, they do not always take the trouble to read the book they are reviewing, but sometimes select a passage or two and enter into a long dissertation, or a commendation or condemnation of the work or the author, till they have written enough. A writer was once applied to by a bookseller, to give a review of a work published by a rival. He sat down, ran over the table of contents, chose a few passages, wrote what he pleased on them, and paid no attention to the rest of the book. A person asked him if he might not do the author injustice by omitting to read his book. "Hold your tongue," said he, "I never should get through with my business at that rate."

Now it is easy for a reviewer to make the impression on his readers, by copying scattered passages, and throwing out general remarks, that he has carefully read, and attentively considered the book before him, while he knows little about it, and is totally indifferent whether he makes just or false impressions on the public concerning its merits. Indeed the reviewer no doubt often sits down determined to misrepresent it, in some way or other. His object is to satisfy the publisher who has employed him, and to gratify the prejudices of the people, so far as to make them purchase the work.

In reviews which are conducted on such principles, few just apprehensions of new books are given out, and consequently little valuable information is to

be derived from them. Misapprehensions are not knowledge, though we may think they are. Hence it often happens, that we are farther from the knowledge of a work after reading a review of it than we were before. I had read many reviewers, from my early life; and from my acquaintance with them had formed ideas of their sources and the motives of their writers, which corresponded very well with those expressed by the author I have mentioned above.

This, however, is not all. Reviews not only present us with discussions on the merits of books, but they contain exhibitions of customs, manners, the lives of distinguished men, and many other matters, which have often been very valuable. Johnson, Smollet, Horsley and others wrote reviews; and in their discussions you will find very useful exhibitions of the subject they take up. This is true also of the productions of Mr. Badcock, a clergyman who treated Priestly and made him, I believe, as sore as the attacks of Horsley himself.

The Edinburgh Review has hardly taken up the plan of discussion. It was first set up in opposition to the Christian Review and the English government, especially against the system established by Mr. Pitt. Many of the reviewers are men of superior talents.

The Quarterly Review was set up in opposition to the Edinburgh, and its object was to discuss political subjects. The writers of this publication are every where friendly to religion. In it Mr. Canning has displayed great ability, and discussions have also been very ably conducted by a few others. An article on the

plan of instruction pursued at Oxford, in reply to one in the Edinburgh Review, is finely done. The Scotch reviewers must be mortified, if there is any mortifying spot left on them, though this is a cat-of-one tail instead of nine.

In works of this kind many topics are discussed which would not be, if such works did not exist; and as they are fashionable, useful subjects may be presented by them to persons who would not be reached by other means. Foster has proved, that a literary journal may be connected with religion, politics, and good sense.

Reviews will be useful or otherwise, according to the character of those who manage them. The Anti-Jacobin Examiner has been good from the beginning. The Edinburgh reviewers are men like Bonaparte. They are opposed to religion and goodness, and are in fact on the side of Napoleon. No one who loves the copy can help loving the original; and he is as near a fiend as any thing in this world. I wonder at their love for him, more than at that shown by some Americans. To be attached to a fiend! he who can look on and see the millions he destroys, and the misery he brings upon mankind, without abhorrence, is a wonder to me. Such examples as we have of those who admire him, sink down the character of man: but it is more astonishing to me to see those in Great Britain who are in danger of having their wives, children, and friends fall into the hands of this vulture, rejoice in his prosperity. By feelings which some reviewers produce by their writings, they destroy the happiness of man here: by the propagation of their infidelity, they ruin their prospects of

blessedness hereafter. I would say of them as Jacob said: "My soul, come not thou unto their secret; unto their assembly, mine honor, be not thou united."

The reviews of Germany are most hostile to religion and morals. A portion of the Germans are more corrupted than the French: the French are corrupted, root and branch, and they have contaminated the Germans by their intrigues. It was Jeroboam, the son of Nebat, with superior power. The German philosophers are the worst that ever disgraced the name of philosophy, and wind their wisps round the minds of men without reason or common sense. For ought I know, all the reviews in Germany have been engaged in the same cause. They have generally taken the most effectual measures to appear as good soldiers of Satan: as strong enemies of the human race. Reviewers have thus far almost always leagued with the foes of man. The views of religion of the Quarterly Review are exceedingly lame and partial. The Edinburgh Reviewers are always wrong on politics. A government formed on their principle could not exist: it is contrary to all facts.

If it is the interest of the human race to be faithful servants of God, to be prepared for a kingdom that fadeth not away, Reviews are not "beneficial."

As to taste, these publications contain a few good pieces of poetry, but the rest are intolerably lame. In all things the reviewers are bad conductors of the public taste, because they are generally ignorant. The Christian Observer is the best review I have ever known; for though some of its papers are not of much importance, others are able to a degree which is not exceed-

ed by any thing I have seen. They point to what is right, and show a spirit of candor. When they attempt to discriminate in important cases, they go right, and must keep many of their readers so. In contests they have almost always paralyzed their enemies.

As reviews exhibit such various principles in politics, religion, morals, taste, &c. a review may be compared with a ship. It brings many commodities; and it is difficult to say whether it is better to be without them or not. You had better proceed in regard to them, as the fishermen did with the fish they caught in that net to which the kingdom of heaven is likened: they gathered the good into baskets, and cast the bad away.

DISPUTE XXXIX.

April 19th, 1814.

Question. *Is man advancing to a state of Perfectibility?*

DECISION.

THERE has been a general improvement of the human mind, since the period when some great number of the human race separated from the family of Noah. Many of these were hunters. The perfect hunting state exists in a high degree of perfection as found among the inhabitants of this country. Their ancestors left Asia without bringing any great improvements, and crossed Behring's Straits, without being able to bring any domestic animals, unless dogs and cats. They however brought a tradition of the deluge, and this has been found among their descendants, particularly the Mohicaneews, who inhabited the country from the land of the Iroquois to the coast. When you pass along down to the south, you find the views of some of the nations much enlarged, and the Mexicans improved greatly in several respects. The Toltecas brought their arts with them. There we shall see the transition from the hunting state. This is the state of which many of the family of Noah partook. When human life was nearly one thousand years, it cannot

be disputed that there were great improvements probably made. Accordingly we find in the remotest antiquity the Zodiac. It was not the production of the Hindoos, Burmans, Chaldeans, or any other people or sects. All their accounts contain the same names and the same schemes of thought; and these correspondences show that the traditions were made before the deluge.

Alphabetic writing also was handed down from the deluge. We find the same alphabet among many nations, who could not have made it. In cases where these have been lost, there seems to be no tendency towards a new invention. The Indians have for two thousand years made their weekwams in the same manner, and worked with the same hoes and other tools. When society is reduced to the hunting state, the human mind has no tendency to rise out of it. Leave the Indians alone, and they will be Indians three hundred and thirty-five thousand years, if the time were allowed them.

In a state a little above the hunting state, it is said that the mind has a tendency to improvement. It is true. This has been exhibited among the Araucanians, the Mexicans, and other Indian nations of the south. It was not the ambition to emulate their ancestors in glory, which excited them. The Mexicans wrought gold and silver so well, that the Europeans allowed that they could not emulate them. Some Eastern nations have equally excelled more civilized workmen.

Where men have got beyond this state, they arrive at a condition which I cannot describe to you. There

is a period which you may date, if you please, in European history, about the time of the discovery of America and the Cape of Good Hope. Somewhere about that time Europeans seem to have received a great impulse; and they have continued to proceed ever since. To this many causes contributed; and among the rest Roger Bacon's labors in philosophy.

It will be unnecessary to pursue the subject any further. All nations, you will observe, will not of course continue to improve, because they have made some progress. The Hindoos by their government are hindered from improving: the Chinese by their state of society; and if you keep them from every other nation, they will not improve. They can imitate a picture exactly; but they cannot form a correct copy of a landscape, or of any thing else. They are so ignorant of perspective that they will make a distant man just as large as a near one. For ten centuries the Chinese have not advanced at all. During a period anterior to that, however, they made much progress. Their manufactures of ivory particularly, show great improvements in manual art. The Hindoos do not advance, but keep at the same stage of society. The Mahomedans stick to the Koran just as they have done for ten centuries. This subject, if you please, you may pursue much further. You see improvements going on wonderfully in the two last centuries in some other countries, more than all mankind had made before since the deluge. Some of the ancients had arts which we have never reached. I have not noticed the progressive steps of nations from war, superstition, &c. The

dark ages derived their darkness from government and superstition. Their government, which was the Feudal system, is the worst in the world. Men of bad character had great power and influence: and we see at the present day that it is the tendency of a state of war to produce effects on society similar to those which distinguish that system. We see that if wars had continued constantly as they then did, erasing all human improvements, Europe would now have been an Arabian desert.

With these views we shall see how far human improvements are liable to progression. It is a fact that there is very little law in France, except as it pleases the Emperor to regard the principles of law to establish his power. The present King of Great Britain has been liberal to painting and music. Of course they have received a great impulse. Men cannot act without motives. Where the circumstances of men are favorable to improvement, improvements will be made, and *vice versa*. All progress towards prefection must then be in a measure casual. I don't mean really so, but what is commonly so called. Those things are incidental, and depend on personal character and other circumstances. If Diogenes should again come into the world, he should be as much a Cynic as ever.

The Inquisition has forbidden many books in Spain. The Spectator is among them. Now carry this farther, and we shut out all books. If you do this, the next generation will be as ignorant as men can be. War will probably be found to discourage all improvements on the whole.

I think that despotism is sinking in the world. I

do not know that I shall find any to agree with me. You find in the English what you will in vain look for in other conquerors. Great Britain, as Lord Castlereagh says, will make great sacrifices for peace: though she does not want it for her own interest. I believe a peace will take place. I believe that Europe, as a body, will need a peace, and will have it, and not be involved in war again. I believe that Christianity will gain ground: for I see Greeks, Armenians, Mahommedans, Jews, Papists, &c. people of other nations, favorable to the spreading of religion. I am of the opinion that the Millennium is not to come all at once, but is to alleviate the evils of mankind by degrees. It is not to burst upon us like the morning, but creep upon us like the twilight. I think then there is no reason to suppose that the world is to go back: but, on the contrary, constantly forward. Improvements are making on so large a scale, as to outrun every thing which has been known before. I do not think that Providence is doing all this to no purpose. I believe these are not like clouds without rain; but I believe they will shed their blessings upon the earth.

As to knowledge, I think it is rightly remarked, that the experience of ages has shown us, that it will not make us better. The Emperor Napoleon is a knowing man, but he is a wicked one. He has not made his fellow men happy. We do not generally see that men who know are servants of their Creator. But when good is spread over the world, we may expect also that knowledge will be the handmaid of improvement, and that energy will be called forth for

the benefit of the human race. I believe that the stock of human happiness will be constantly enlarging.

See the improvements we have. If we invent a way to turn a thousand spindles we pay an hundred hands. We have found that the small-pox may be prevented by a milder disease arising from the udders of cows; and by resorting to the process of innoculation, we save on a moderate calculation the lives of multitudes of men. Probably some efficient remedy or preventive will hereafter be found for the plague and the yellow fever. These inventions we commonly attribute to human ingenuity: but the author is God. Knowledge will increase, and great improvements will still be made. I believe it will not be more than one or two centuries, before there will be such a restraint on human passions, and such influences exerted through various channels, that it will make the world appear as if all the good men in it were brought together. All this will take place; but when we have done, it will be as far from the perfectibility which fools talk of, as the mite from a man, and an oyster from a whale. That perfectibility is the *conatus ad motum* which Epicurus found in his atoms: what never was exerted, and probably never will be.

DISPUTE XL.

April 20th, 1814.

Question. *Are Wars beneficial?*

DECISION.

THERE are two ways in which this subject may be considered, by which some progress towards a decision may be made.

1st. We may give an exhibition of war, such as experience presents. In all the situations in which man has ever been placed, there is none more unfavorable than a state of war, for the mind and the manners. I speak at large. It will not be doubted that science has been in some respects promoted by it: but in how many other points has it been productive of evil! In the Revolutionary war many things useful and necessary to society were much discouraged by the state of things. Among other cases it might be mentioned that the wages of ministers, being reduced almost to nothing, prevented young men from becoming clergymen, and contributed to the scarcity of them. In this matter I speak from experience. The war was formidable to every department of science. When I went from my mother's house, after the death of my father, and preached occasionally for different congregations, the payment, to clergymen, being made in the

depreciated paper money of the country, amounted to almost nothing. The price for preaching one sabbath was then four dollars, which was equal to about sixteen dollars now, if paid in silver. The schoolmasters also were paid in Continental money; and the physicians and lawyers were much defrauded out of their honest debts, by being paid in the same manner. And this evil extended every where, to people of all conditions. In France things are in much the same state now; and the evils arising from war are on several accounts far greater than they were with us; for, among other things, the desk was not here employed by the government as it is there to an immense extent. In colleges the effects are two-fold in France: the students are not quietly employed in their studies when they profess to be; and many parents send their children to places of learning to preserve them from drafts and impressments. Every war has thus crowded the institutions of France: but not with students. It is a fact that during war, the attendants at colleges have been idle and profligate to an enormous degree.

War demands certain kinds of sciences! such as chemistry and mathematics, because they must administer to its conduct: but only a few branches of the latter are needed, and the former but to a limited degree. The utmost that science can do to war is to mollify it; and as war is acknowledged to be only a lesser evil when conducted with fewest ill effects, one would think that peace must be a blessing. It is an odd sort of gain which is only the less of two evils. I do not think that science has flourished as well in this

country in war as it would have done in peace. I do not think war is beneficial to it.

2d. *Human morals.* On this point there can be no debate. I have been a witness of the corruptions of men in other contests before the present, and I know that the Revolutionary war greatly demoralized us. Before it began the country was religious. In Northampton it was supposed that a majority of the inhabitants were persons of piety: but the change was afterwards great. The war turned many of the people in this country into infidels. Of these there were two kinds: one, thinking men, the other thoughtless. I was well acquainted with the state of things at the time, and speak of what I know. Some men who had good reputations, were and had been men of bad morals. I was chaplain in the army, and thus formed an acquaintance with many men actively engaged in the war. There I found persons, who had no solid principle. Their common conversation was often revolting. They had formed a shocking familiarity with war, and would talk of butchering men, as if they had been butchers, talking about slaughtering an ox. It is true they were attached to the country, and were so trained as to make good soldiers. The soldiers of that period were patriots, though bad men; and the difference between patriots and no patriots is greater, young gentlemen, than you think. But when the army was disbanded, and these men returned to their homes, with the bad principles and habits they had acquired, infidelity spread over the country like a flood. They thought but little more about religion, than of the inhabitants of Jupiter. I should be loth even to tell

you of the grossness which existed in some parts of the army. Some parts of it were as corrupt as any set of men you can point out any where.

3d. With regard to *happiness*, I think Horace has very well described this part of the subject: "Desiderunt reges," &c. Rulers make war, and the people pay for it. Wars are made without consulting the happiness of nations: the motives are of a very different nature; and the general fact is, that the idle, the profligate, all those who are perfectly without principle in a nation, are in favor of war; while such as are sober, industrious and moral, consider it a terrible evil.

The personal and domestic evils of war are great. You must recollect, that fathers, husbands, brothers, sons, and friends must be destroyed by it, and the death of each aggravated by the circumstances causes distresses which it is not easy to estimate. These things we customarily do not include in our view, when we think of war; we are apt to pass them by in a mass, as we do the thoughts of the sacrifice of life among the cattle when we walk through a market. But death is a great evil to most of those who suffer it in war. Life to them is of immense importance. All other blessings are dependent on it: it is the hinge on which they turn. We know that war kills many in the field; that it cuts off many by disease; that it leaves upon far greater multitudes the consequences of wounds, exposure, fatigue and sickness. All these effects we do not feel or even think of, to be sure, when we are drinking our tea and smoking our pipes, and talking about war, but they are evils not less numerous or important on that account.

It is remarkable that the common language of mankind is marked with the strongest expressions in relation to the real character of war. It speaks familiarly of "the horrors of war," "the scourge of war;" and these words have not been so long in use without an adequate cause. In this country we are almost ignorant of the evils of war. We have not had many cities burnt, and have had no experience in those trials which many other nations have known: of course it requires some consideration in us to get just ideas of the calamities which war produces.

One of the ways in which a country suffers from war, is by the waste of food. As soon as war arises the food of a country is drawn off in great quantities: for an army consumes more than four times as much as the same number of men in peaceful life, yet do not engage in any labor to contribute to the stock. Vast quantities of food are also often lost by accidents, capture, &c. We lost to the amount of two millions at Niagara, which is necessarily the loss of two millions of days' work of industrious laborers. Arms and accoutrements, ammunition, and many other expensive articles are also wasted in great quantities. I am informed by Mr. Whitney, that a million of muskets have been wasted during this war, which would cost thirteen millions of dollars, yet, with such a spirit as actuates us, we sit down and see, very contentedly, an enormous debt accumulating; though when we examine into the subject, we find that war impoverishes a country much more than we might have supposed. Our sufferings from poverty were excessive during the Revolution, and for some time after it. It was no uncom-

mon thing, when the money had become greatly depreciated, to have four shillings pass for sixty dollars. When I went to Greenfield, and for some time afterwards, four dollars in silver were worth one hundred in paper. A man's property, at such a rate of reduction, will soon become reduced to little value. Property suffers in various ways from war; and a gentleman, whose opinion was worthy of great respect, told me, after hostilities had existed but a short time in Germany, that the evils which Hamburgh had already suffered could not be remedied in less than fifty years.

The loss of men is a very serious consequence of war. An inhabitant of this place, who has travelled in Europe, informs me, that he found the shops to a great extent supplied with female clerks: the men, having been taken off in the armies, were not to be obtained.

But what is the account of war given by the Scriptures? It is called one of God's great judgments. It is therefore a calamity: and it is so great a calamity, that David preferred pestilence to it. And David knew war intimately; he had had much experience in it, and had felt as well as seen its effects. He had been so much a man of war, that God was not pleased to permit him to build the temple on account of it. I think the Scriptures have decided the question which we have been discussing, for their language is uniform and forcible against war, as one of the greatest evils to which mankind are subjected. Why should not we view it in the same light? We never question the evil of pestilence, famine, wild beasts, earthquakes and the like; and why should we entertain any doubt with respect to war?

But the Scriptures attribute wars to the worst possible sources, and show that their origin is evil. St. James says: "Whence come wars and fightings among you? Come they not hence, even of your lusts?" It will not be said that what proceeds from such sources will be good.

It is to be remarked, also, that the Scriptures, in speaking of happiness, almost always include the idea of peace. The salutation is: "Peace be with you." It is the rational salutation; it is the expressive language of the common sense of mankind, whenever they wish to utter benevolent feelings. Prosperity and peace, in the language of the Scriptures, are synonymous terms: now *quere*, whether the Almighty would not use language aright. The Millennium is foretold as a time of peace; and the prophet enters into it with rapture: "I will extend peace to her as a river." Now if war is beneficial, this expression, as well as many others, must have been made under a misconception of its nature. It is also said to be the state of the new heavens and the new earth: for "in them dwelleth peace."

It appears therefore, that the Scriptures are as clear on this point as it is possible for them to be.

Upon the whole, I think that although war has, in some few instances, been productive of some good, it must be viewed as a great evil. It has often awakened energy: but that energy has not always been employed for right purposes. In those instances in which it has effected the release of nations from absolute tyranny, it has done good.

Such are the views which I have formed of this subject.

DISPUTE XLI.

April 26th, 1814.

Question. *Can the Immortality of the Soul be proved from the Light of Nature?*

Remark 1st. I have often heard it remarked, that it is an imputation on the divine character, to suppose that God will destroy the souls of brutes. It is also inferred that brutes are immortal, from the text which says, "the soul of the beast which goeth downward to the earth." How can we conceive of any thing going downward or in any other direction, after it has been annihilated? Motion is not predicable of non-existence. We cannot see any reason why it may not be consistent with the goodness of God, to communicate happiness to the brutes after death as well as in this world. I have often heard the question argued; but there is not evidence afforded us on the subject.

Remark 2d. Many physicians have lately inculcated the doctrine, that derangement is produced by a disorder of the body. A celebrated physician, by proceeding on this theory nearly restored the Queen of Prussia to reason, and has cured the King of England. For the former he proposed a voyage at sea in a frigate; and I would have you remember, that in many cases

nothing does delirious persons so much good, as to be removed from the scenes with which they have been familiar. The Queen's father confessor, however, would not consent to her being intrusted to the hands of a Huguenot.

It is a very common opinion, that delirium belongs to the mind alone; and the reason on which it is founded is, that the mind, in that state, generally fixes on some one thing, with a very erroneous view of it, and receives the most preposterous error as truth. A man of great distinction in Northampton some years ago, Major Hawley, was subject to occasional fits of alienation of mind. On one occasion he expressed great concern because the swivel of his well-chain was broken. His cows he said could not drink at the brook on the other side of the street, and therefore would not give so much milk as usual, and therefore his family, which consisted only of his wife and himself, must inevitably starve. It was in vain to tell him how easily the original difficulty might be overcome: he insisted that the blacksmith could not mend the chain. Cases of this nature are common; and people, supposing that such strange fancies could not be got out of the mind except by putting something else in their place, have administered medicine to it, under the belief that it was in a state of disease. But you might as well give medicine to any thing else, as to the mind while the body is out of order.

DECISION.

The decision of this question must always be referred to the Divine Mind. We cannot tell what God

will do: it is out of our power to determine any thing whatever beyond those limits that he has prescribed. Wherever he has taught us in his word, and in his works, or afforded us probable instruction in his works, we have knowledge, though in different degrees; and from what we derive from these sources we must judge as well as we are able.

He who formed the soul can annihilate it; and all the views we take of it must be in submission to his power and will. All the states of the mind must be what God pleases they shall be. With these feelings, we should direct our attention towards the general inquiry: What have been the arguments afforded by nature concerning the point in question?

These I shall first mention: but I shall not mention all.

The Doctrine of the Immateriality of the Soul, I considered last Sabbath, and considered it minutely. If this doctrine be not granted, no argument can be derived from it. I will notice what has been said by those who deny it.

It is said, that the mind goes through a regular process of growth, till it arrives at perfection, and then decays. Now this is a case in which abstract terms are used, and deceive. It is taken for granted that the body and soul begin to exist together, and grow and decline together; and thence the conclusion is drawn, that they die together. Hence those who deny the immortality and the immateriality of the soul derive the ground of their argument. They say, that the birth, changes and death of the body and of the soul, being simultaneous, they must be parts of the same thing, or

one must be a part of the other. But even if we should admit that they grow, decay, and terminate together, we should not be forced into this conclusion. We might as well say that a man and a tree which have begun to grow, and have flourished and died together, were parts of the same thing, or that one was part of another. Such an assertion would not be admitted.

The truth is, the body and soul do not attain perfection at the same time. The decay of the soul does not commence with the decay of the body. The body often begins to decay early. President Edwards's body was a frail tenement, such as, it was supposed, would last but a little time. He was obliged to take exercise constantly, and was compelled to observe a strict regimen, to preserve even an indifferent state of health. He had a silver bowl to drink his chocolate from, with a mark to show exactly the quantity which he should take. Now the mind which inhabited that body was not inferior to the minds of those beef-eating men we sometimes see, who look as if they were made to live a hundred and fifty years. There is, therefore, no analogy between the most perfect bodies and the most perfect minds which we find in the world.

The mind and the body do not grow or decay together. Colonel Stoddard of Northampton was perfectly unnoticed till he was thirty years of age. His mind was not the same in the earlier part of his life, as it was after that period: to use it was long unknown to him. But in later life he managed Massachusetts very nearly as a man manages his walking-stick. A multitude of persons, in all countries, have grown in understanding from fifty to sixty years of age.

Look at Johnson's Lives of the Poets, and Tour to the Hebrides: they were written as well as any of his books, and at a period after he was seventy years old. Take a man in new habits when he is fifty, and he will not succeed well, because his old ones have become fixed: but in his own ways a man will last well till he is seventy, eighty, and even eighty-five. Dr. Franklin retained his powers of mind till eighty, or eighty-five. The mind, in many instances, at the time of death, seems brighter than it ever did before, and in still more instances as bright. And this is sometimes the case after it has appeared to have decayed. Mr. Canfield, a clergyman of this state, for some years lost the exercise of his reason. His mind appeared to be gone; and it was supposed it would never be restored to its former state. But, a short time before his last sickness, the darkness all fell off, and his intellectual powers were as bright as ever. This was not owing to the growth of the powers of the body: for he was not improving in strength. His death occurred not long afterwards, but he died brilliant—strong. Another man whom I might mention, was in such a state of mind, a part of his life, that he could not put two sentences together; and yet he afterwards recovered the full exercise of his reason.

There is therefore no truth in the position, that the mind is a part of the body, or that they are parts of the same thing. In a few instances the increase and decay of the mind may proceed with those of the body: but this is far from being commonly the fact. Dr. Dana of this town was never more witty or more wise than at eighty. Dr. Trumbull, of this state, now liv-

ing, is an example of the same kind. He is engaged at this time in finishing his history of Connecticut.

As we have no proof of annihilation to present, the doctrine is taken up gratuitously. But even if the annihilation of matter were admitted, there would be nothing connected with it like the annihilation of mind. As mind has no parts, it cannot be divided: and in this respect it is essentially different from matter. But there are many strong reasons, furnished by nature, to lead to the belief that the soul is immortal. It is observed that the Providence of God does not treat men alike in this world. Many good men have been subject to great trials in this life, and many bad ones have been placed among comforts and enjoyments. Asaph says, "The eyes of the wicked stand out with fatness." Solomon says, "There is one end to the righteous and the wicked." These remarks arose from the observance of facts in their days; and the same sentiments are confirmed by the common experience of mankind. It would be naturally presumed, that God would treat those with less kindness who are enemies to him, and *vice versa*. All are sinners, but some are less so than others; yet the latter often suffer less in this world than the former. Hence it might reasonably be presumed, that there will be another state, in which the characters of men will be more regarded, and in which those who have disobeyed God will be less happy than those who have more faithfully kept his commandments. This is an argument difficult to be overthrown or removed. I do not see that it can be. I do not think it a demonstration, but a strong probability.

And this argument is so natural, that we find the belief in the immortality of the soul almost universal. The Bosjesmans and Caffres are said not to believe in the existence of God. Whether they believe in the immortality of the soul I do not know. Men have derived their ideas of the soul's immortality from one of the following sources: 1st. From this course of reasoning, or 2dly. From the traditions of revelation. And in favor of the doctrine common reason has decided. A man should bring good reasons for any opinion opposed to the common sense of mankind: otherwise he will not be able to oppose it. The desire of the mind for immortality is rationally advanced, to prove that it has an endless existence. Who has implanted this desire? For what reason? Probably the brutes never think on such a subject: but every man feels it. Savages think of it as strongly, and often more wisely, than those who have the evidences of the gospel; and the belief in the doctrine has undoubtedly, in all ages, been universal.

All men have consciences. The conscience is a judge of right and wrong. Why is this in the possession of every man? It is so ordered by God. Is it for any end? One would be surprised to learn that such a thing had been given to man without any end. I grant that there may be an end which we are not conscious of, and that it is the end intended by the Divine Mind. But this is a mere supposition; and hypotheses, you know, are of very little weight in reasoning.

With regard to the fact, whether the soul can lose this life without annihilation, I can believe it. I think it has a principle of life in itself. It seems to be a diffi-

cult thing to admit the opposite, and I do not see any argument in favor of it.

The arguments to be derived from the light of nature, in favor of the immortality of the soul, amount, therefore, to a strong probability. All the probability is on this side, and there is none on the other; and it ought to influence all our conduct on the subject.

THE END.

Date Due

DEC 1 8 '50			
FEB 3 '51			
OCT 2 6 '55			
FACULTY			
[illegible] 58			

PS739 .D2
President Dwight's decisions of
Princeton Theological Seminary–Speer Library
1 1012 00003 1437